

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church, McDaniel's Chapel, Shellmound, Tenn.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Resolutions of Edward Lenox Post, No. 39, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of stockmen of Overton, Nebr., in relation to the free distribution of blackleg vaccine by the Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, affidavit to accompany House bill No. 9531, granting a pension to Hiram S. Kingsley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: Petition of Miss Susan B. Anthony and the Woman Suffrage Association of the District of Columbia, in favor of a constitutional amendment giving the right of franchise to women—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. Levi J. Donaldson, of Tavares, Fla., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4478, relating to pensions for the loss of limbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Ben W. Johnson, of Elyria, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill No. 6879, providing for the employment of women nurses in the military hospitals of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Colonel John T. Poland Post, No. 695, of the State Soldiers' Home, Ohio; also petition of Keller Post, No. 128, of Bucyrus, Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at or near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of C. C. Knapp, of Castalia, Ohio, and L. W. Lerner, of Fremont, Ohio, to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Local Union No. 4, Washington, D. C., International Association of Bookbinders, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 6872, to print the label of the Allied Printing Trades on all publications of the Government—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, protests of L. G. Holmes and 13 others, of Ceylon; H. G. Smith and 9 others, of North Monroeville, and E. Gilmer and 30 others, of Galion, Ohio, against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Club of Columbia, S. C., favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 1439, to amend the act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTEY: Petition of Mrs. Mary Carlton and others, of Roanoke City, Va., and S. E. Wildman, of Bodycamp, Va., against the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. POWERS: Remonstrance of H. A. Kempton and others, of Rutland County, Vt., in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petitions of Jennie Wilson and other citizens of the counties of Delaware, Tompkins, and Binghamton, State of New York, in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: Papers to accompany House bill No. 9236, for the relief of Hermas S. Soules, of Buffalo, N. Y.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of George Batt and others, of Buffalo, N. Y., in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of Denver, Colo., urging the passage of Senate bill No. 1439, relative to amendments to the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Paper to accompany House bill No. 102, relating to the claim of Levi Field—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), petitions of Mrs. J. C. Courts, L. H. Horrell, John Homer, and others, in the State of Kentucky, in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition of Retail Grocers and General Merchants' Association of North Dakota, for the passage of a bill prohibiting the use of trading checks, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of J. G. Campbell, of Perth; E. F. Ladd, of Fargo; T. E. Metcalf, of Lakota, N. Dak., against the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of General Crook Post, No. 69, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota, indorsing the bill to establish a Branch Home for disabled

soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petitions of Mrs. Frank W. Grant, Hiram W. Sanborn, and others, of Dover, and P. W. Wiggan and 9 others, of New Market, N. H., against the passage of the Loud bill relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WACHTER: Paper to accompany House bill to increase the pension of Adam Bieger, late of Company G, Third Maryland Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: Petition of Lillian Thompson and others, of Rescue, Mich.; also communication of J. S. Stearns, secretary of state of Michigan, in relation to the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: Papers in support of House bill for the relief of Amanda Carnes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

MONDAY, March 19, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on motion of Mr. BAKER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

SCHOONER ST. PATRICK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the schooner *St. Patrick*, Lemuel Bourne, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SCHOONER SOPHIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the schooner *Sophia*, Francis O'Meara, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 197) for the relief of Hattie A. Phillips; and

A bill (S. 427) for the relief of A. F. Fleet, superintendent of the Missouri Military Academy, Mexico, Mo.

The message also announced that the House had passed, with amendments, the bill (S. 68) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal School thereon, and for a public park; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 309) granting a pension to James M. Kercheval;

A bill (H. R. 524) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Davis;

A bill (H. R. 854) granting an increase of pension to John J. McCormick;

A bill (H. R. 2477) granting an increase of pension to George H. Pennington;

A bill (H. R. 2749) granting a pension to Susan Garrison;

A bill (H. R. 3067) granting an increase of pension to Melvina Bottles;

A bill (H. R. 3071) granting an increase of pension to John F. Nelson;

A bill (H. R. 3072) to increase the pension of William W. Wharton;

A bill (H. R. 4416) to increase the pension of Henry Geesen;

A bill (H. R. 5156) granting an increase of pension to Frances C. Kirby;

A bill (H. R. 5509) granting a pension to Malinda Jones; and

A bill (H. R. 6575) granting a pension to Matilda G. Higbee.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 445) for the relief of Clare M. Ashby, widow of

W. W. Ashby, late United States consul at Colon;

A bill (H. R. 1454) for the relief of William L. Orr;

A bill (H. R. 2322) for the relief of Joshua Bishop;

A bill (H. R. 2757) to authorize the purchase of certain lands in the district of Alaska;

A bill (H. R. 4686) for the relief of J. A. Ware; and

A bill (H. R. 5969) for the relief of the devisees and legal representatives of D. L. Huskey, deceased.

The message further transmitted to the Senate the resolutions of the House commemorative of the life and public services of Hon. MONROE L. HAYWARD, late Senator-elect from the State of Nebraska.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 2279) declaring Cuivre River to be not a navigable stream;

A bill (S. 2354) enlarging the powers of the Choctaw, Oklahoma and Gulf Railroad Company;

A bill (H. R. 4648) granting an increase of pension to William G. McLain;

A joint resolution (S. R. 91) authorizing the printing of extra copies of the publications of the Office of Naval Intelligence, Navy Department; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 204) to provide for the removal of snow and ice in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a memorial of the Zion's Ensign of Missouri, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Real Estate Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish the documentary stamp tax; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the St. Louis Furniture Board of Trade, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to confine the sale of articles manufactured by prison labor to the State in which they are manufactured; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Mercantile Club of Kansas City, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to increase the present tax of 2 cents on butterine to 10 cents a pound; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Company H, Second Regiment National State Guard of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the armament of the militia; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Broken Bow, Nebr., remonstrating against the passage of the parcels-post bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of the Enterprise, of Clarks; the Register, of Hebron, and of the Young Men's Christian Association of Lincoln, all in the State of Nebraska, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Greenport, N. Y., praying for the passage of House bill No. 7734, to provide against nuisances; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the manufacture and sale of cigarettes in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Jamestown, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relative to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 1, Stereotypers' Union, of New York City, praying for the enactment of legisla-

tion to protect free labor from prison competition, and also to limit the hours of the daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon the public works of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Dorian Lodge, No. 204, International Association of Machinists, of Schenectady, N. Y., and a petition of Empire Lodge, No. 153, International Association of Machinists, of Auburn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of machinists employed at the Government Printing Office at Washington, D. C.; which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a memorial of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, of New York, remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 560, relative to the transportation of cattle from one State to another; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of the American Hair Dresser, of Brooklyn; the Advertiser, of Warwick; the Sunnyside, of New York City; the Fruitman's Guide, of New York City, and of sundry citizens of Utica, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Indian River Grange, No. 19; Portville Grange, No. 842; Ross Grange, No. 305; Falkhill Grange, No. 882; Rathbone Grange, No. 656; Maple Grove Grange, No. 879; Ovid Grange, No. 155; Ellington Grange, No. 528; Parish Grange, No. 575; Stanford Grange, No. 408; Colesville Grange, No. 578; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 559; Madison Grange, No. 854; Upper Lisle Grange, No. 508; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Bergen Grange, No. 162; Glendare Grange, No. 548; Acme Grange, No. 598; Great Bend Grange, No. 642; Coopers Grange, No. 820; Morristown Grange, No. 676; Hornellsville Grange, No. 879; Fair Play Grange, No. 654; Caton Grange, No. 248; Elba Grange, No. 83; Golden Sheaf Grange, No. 587; Villanova Grange, No. 604; Onondaga Hill Grange, No. 682; Neils Creek Grange, No. 345; Hartford Grange, No. 860; Bethany Grange, No. 748; Bowens Corners Grange, No. 99; Camden Grange, No. 554; Mountain Grange, No. 245; Honeoye Falls Grange, No. 6, and Charlton Grange, No. 661, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, praying for the election of United States Senators by a popular vote of the people; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of Cape Vincent Grange, No. 579; Morning Star Grange, No. 520; Upper Lisle Grange, No. 508; New York Grange, No. 1020; Ellington Grange, No. 528; Highland Grange, No. 22; Stillwater Grange, No. 681; Greenfield Grange, No. 801; Freedom Plains Grange, No. 857; Bethany Grange, No. 747; Fayetteville Grange, No. 610; Elba Grange, No. 783; Parish Grange, No. 575; Schoharie County Pomona Grange; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Hornellsville Grange, No. 840; Indian River Grange, No. 19; Dansville Grange, No. 178; Progressive Grange, No. 537; Ross Grange, No. 305; Camden Grange, No. 354; Bowens Corners Grange, No. 99; Addison Grange, No. 854; Byron Grange, No. 395; Poolville Grange, No. 770; Sherborn Grange, No. 110; Oakhill Grange, No. 252; Ashley Grange, No. 172; Worcester Grange, No. 240; Mattapoisett Grange, No. 215; Oxford Grange, No. 89; Boxboro Grange, No. 131; Haskell Grange, No. 360; Charlotte Center Grange, No. 669; Otego Grange, No. 788; North Colesville Grange, No. 515; Fanning Grange, No. 22; Ovid Grange, No. 155; Charlton Grange, No. 661; Rathbone Grange, No. 656; South Richmond Grange, No. 256; Richdale Grange, No. 722; West Onondaga Grange, No. 464; Morristown Grange, No. 676, and Chautauqua County Pomona Grange, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, praying for the extension of rural free mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Ovid Grange, No. 155; Parish Grange, No. 575; Rathbone Grange, No. 655; Ellington Grange, No. 528; Richford Grange, No. 620; Portville Grange, No. 842; Addison Grange, No. 854; Honeoye Falls Grange, No. 6; Upper Lisle Grange, No. 508; Mostpaw Grange, No. 45; Fairplay Grange, No. 654; Hornellsville Grange, No. 846; Bergen Grange, No. 163; Glendare Grange, No. 548; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Great Bend Grange, No. 646; Goshen Grange, No. 720; Neils Creek Grange, No. 345; Hartford Grange, No. 850; Baden Grange, No. 354; Morristown Grange, No. 676; Bowens Corners Grange, No. 99; Elba Grange, No. 783; Indian River Grange, No. 19; Falkhill Grange, No. 882; Ross Grange, No. 305; Maple Grove Grange, No. 879; Schoharie County Pomona Grange; Emmet Grange, No. 476; Stanford Grange, No. 808; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599; Colesville Grange, No. 518; Acme Grange, No. 498; Golden Sheaf Grange, No. 587; La Fargeville Grange, No. 15; Caton Grange, No. 248; Onondaga Grange, No. 682, and Charlton Grange, No. 161, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of adequate anti-trust laws; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Elba Grange, No. 783; Ross Grange, No. 305; Addison Grange, No. 854; Dansville Grange, No. 178; Indian River Grange, No. 19; Fayetteville Grange, No. 610; Bethany Grange, No. 748; Upper Lisle Grange, No. 508; Star Grange, No. 245; Hornellsville Grange, No. 846; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Greenfield Grange, No. 807; Stillwater Grange, No. 681; Parish Grange, No. 575; Bowens Corners Grange, No. 99; Highland Grange, No. 22; Poochill Grange, No. 770; Otego Grange, No. 788; Ellington Grange, No. 558; Rathbone Grange, No. 256; North Colesville Grange, No. 518; South Richland Grange, No. 256; Ovid Grange, No. 155; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599; Morristown Grange, No. 676; Camden Grange, No. 354; Meadow Grange and West Onondaga Grange, No. 464, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country protection in the use of shoddy in manufactured goods; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of Poolville Grange, No. 570; Rathbone Grange, No. 656; Charlton Grange, No. 165; Ovid Grange, No. 155; Lake Grange; South Richland Grange, No. 256; Greenfield Grange; No. 507; Addison Grange, No. 554; Ross Grange, No. 305; Dansville Grange, No. 178; Bowens Corners Grange, No. 99; Morristown Grange, No. 476; Camden Grange, No. 554; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599; Highland Grange, No. 22; Ellington Grange, No. 528; Fayetteville Grange, No. 610; Hornellsville Grange, No. 849; Marlow Grange, No. 245; Parish Grange, No. 575; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Elba Grange, No. 783; Prospect Grange; Upper Lisle Grange, No. 208, and Otego Grange, No. 788, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Greenfield Grange, No. 807; Otego Grange, No. 788; West Onondaga Grange, No. 464; Ross Grange; Addison Grange, No. 854; Fayetteville Grange, No. 610; North Colesville Grange, No. 518; Ovid Grange, No. 155; Poolville Grange, No. 170; Cuba Grange, No. 799; South Richland Grange, No. 256; Parish Grange, No. 575; Highland Grange, No. 22; Freedom Plains Grange, No. 857; Stillwater Grange, No. 681; Charlotte Center Grange, No. 669; Charlton Grange, No. 661; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599; Morristown Grange, No. 676; Rathbone Grange, No. 656; Camden Grange, No. 354; Bowens Corners Grange, No. 99; Indian River Grange, No. 19; Hornellsville Grange, No. 849; Dansville Grange, No. 178; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Davisburg Grange, No. 245; Schoharie County Pomona Grange; Ross Grange, No. 305; Elba Grange, No. 783, and Upper Lisle Grange, No. 508, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of Star Grange, No. 1540; Norris Grange, No. 1020; Excelsior Grange, No. 620; Union Grange, No. 718; Elba Grange, No. 783; West Onondaga Grange, No. 464; South Richland Grange, No. 256; Villanova Grange, No. 604; Dansville Grange, No. 178; Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599; Parish Grange, No. 575; Upper Lisle Grange, No. 508; Morristown Grange, No. 676; Camden Grange, No. 354; Bowens Corners Grange, No. 99; Indian River Grange, No. 19; Hornellsville Grange, No. 846; Stafford Grange, No. 418; Haskell Grange, No. 718; Ovid Grange, No. 155; North Colesville Grange, No. 518; Otego Grange, No. 788; Poolville Grange, No. 770; Rathbone Grange, No. 656; South Avona Grange, No. 504; Freedom Plains Grange, No. 857; Greenfield Grange, No. 807; Stillwater Grange, No. 681; Highland Grange, No. 22; Ellington Grange, No. 528; Fayetteville Grange, No. 610; Addison Grange, No. 854, and Ross Grange, No. 305, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of reservoirs or irrigation canals for the irrigation of arid lands; which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented petitions of Cape Vincent Grange, No. 599; Bowens Corners Grange, No. 99; Stanford Grange, No. 808; Acme Grange, No. 498; Camden Grange, No. 354; Upper Lisle Grange, No. 508; Honeoye Falls Grange, No. 6; Villanova Grange, No. 604; Hornellsville Grange, No. 876; Progress Grange, No. 163; Great Bend Grange, No. 642; Coopers Grange, No. 820; Stafford Grange, No. 618; Fairplay Grange, No. 654; La Fargeville Grange, No. 15; Golden Sheaf Grange, No. 587; Elba Grange, No. 783; Onondaga Grange, No. 682; Caton Grange, No. 248; Rathbone Grange, No. 656; Charlton Grange, No. 661; Ovid Grange, No. 155; Parish Grange, No. 575; Richford Grange; Ellington Grange, No. 528; Falkill Grange, No. 882; Ross Grange, No. 305; Indian River Grange, No. 19; Maple Grove Grange, No. 879; Addison Grange, No. 854; Portville Grange, No. 842; Neils Creek Grange, No. 345; Morristown Grange, No. 676; Hartford Grange, No. 860; Colesville Grange, No. 518, and Greenfield Grange, No. 548, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country protec-

tion in the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of Sodus Grange, No. 73, and Walton Grange, No. 536, Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York; of Harrison Grange, No. 151; Mount Carmel Grange, No. 975; Perry Grange, No. 266, Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Ohio; of sundry citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of Ohio; of Union Pomona Grange, No. 17, Patrons of Husbandry, of Maine; and of sundry citizens of the Thirty-fourth Congressional district of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation regulating the sale of dairy products; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry; of Fredonia Grange, No. 1; Fairmount Grange, No. 252; Union Grange, No. 244, and of Sherman Grange, No. 36, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal, for the granting of additional powers to the Interstate Commerce Commission, for rural free mail delivery, for regulating the use of shoddy, and for the regulation of trusts, etc.; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented the memorial of Alpheus P. Hanson, United States surveyor-general for Wyoming; Joseph M. Carey, ex-United States Senator; Therese A. Jenkins, Ellen J. Wetlaufer, and 48 other citizens of Wyoming, remonstrating against the insertion of the word "male" in the suffrage clauses of the forms of government recommended for Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the other new possessions; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. BAKER presented petitions of Delaware Grange, No. 38; Edgerton Grange, No. 435; Indian Creek Grange, No. 1431; Vineland Grange, No. 163; Oak Grange, No. 665, and Maple Grove Grange, No. 240, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented memorials of Greenwood Grange, No. 1087; Indian Creek Grange, No. 1431, and Wea Grange, No. 445, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the construction of reservoirs or irrigating canals for the irrigation of arid lands; which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented petitions of Oak Grange, No. 665; Edgerton Grange, No. 435; Indian Creek Grange, No. 1431; Delaware Grange, No. 38; Vineland Grange, No. 163, and Maple Grove Grange, No. 240, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure adequate anti-trust laws; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Wea Grange, No. 445; Valley Grange, No. 1416; Indian Creek Grange, No. 1431, and Greenwood Grange, No. 1087, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Kansas, praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Wea Grange, No. 445; Pleasant Valley Grange, No. 1416; Indian Creek Grange, No. 1431; Greenwood Grange, No. 1087, and Sunnyside Grange, No. 62, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Kansas, praying for the extension of free rural mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Wea Grange, No. 445; Indian Creek Grange, No. 1431; Pleasant Valley Grange, No. 1416; Greenwood Grange, No. 1087, and Eclipse Grange, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of shoddy in manufactured goods; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of Indian Creek Grange, No. 1431; Vineland Grange, No. 163; Pleasant Valley Grange, No. 1416; Edgerton Grange, No. 435; Maple Grove Grange, No. 240; Delaware Grange, No. 38, and Oak Grange, No. 665, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Kansas, praying for the election of Senators by a popular vote of the people; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of Indian Creek Grange, No. 1431; Greenwood Grange, No. 1087, and Wea Grange, No. 445, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Kansas, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the Central Kansas Democrat, of Sterling; the Western Odd Fellow, of Topeka; the Ledger, of Baldwin; the Better Way, of Minneapolis; the Review, of Inman; the Republican, of Logan; the Industrial Advocate, of Eldorado; the Journal, of Wilsonton; the Herald, of Geneseo; the Weekly Globe, of Parsons; the Democrat-Record, of Emporia; the Advance, of Chetopa, and the News, of Syracuse, all in the State of Kansas, and memorials of the Missouri Valley Farmer, of Kansas City, Mo.; the Minco Weekly, of Minco, Ind. T., and the Republican, of Watonga, Okla., remonstrating against the passage of

the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of 10 citizens of Wakefield; the Herald of Life, of Springfield; the Young Idea, of Boston; the Independent, of Fall River; and the Farm and Home, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented memorials of the Herald Printing Company, of Lynn; the Gospel Sword, of Lagrange; the Republican, of Columbus; the Debs Publishing Company, of Terre Haute; the Junior Builders, of Indianapolis; the Weekly Sun, of Pittsboro; the Independent, of Huntingburg, and the Saturday Call, of Lagrange, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Company L, First Regiment Infantry, National State Guard of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the armament of the militia; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Mystic Grange, No. 58; Readfield Grange, No. 217; Cherryfield Grange, No. 256; Rockemeka Grange, No. 109; Victor Grange, No. 49; Sandy River Grange, No. 89; Bingham Grange, No. 237; Vassalboro Grange, No. 322; Land Grange; Forest Grange, No. 125; Orchard Grange, No. 309; Eureka Grange, No. 13; Golden Harvest Grange, No. 33; North Star Grange, No. 47; and Wesserrunnett Grange, No. 346, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Maine, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Sandy River Grange, No. 89; Vassalboro Grange, No. 322; Spencer Brook Grange, No. 581; Elsie Grange; Round Mountain Grange, No. 162; Eureka Grange, No. 113; Forest Grange, No. 125; Sidney Grange, No. 94; Orchard Grange, No. 309; Bingham Grange, No. 231; Wesserrunnett Grange, No. 346; North Star Grange, No. 47; Golden Harvest Grange, No. 33; Mystic Grange, No. 58; Rockemeka Grange, No. 109; Victor Grange, No. 49; Readfield Grange, No. 217; and Cherryfield Grange, No. 256, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country protection in the use of shoddy in manufactured goods; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of Anson Grange, No. 88; Sidney Grange, No. 194; Lawrence Grange, No. 264; South Montville Grange, No. 271; White Oak Grange, No. 182; Burgham Grange, No. 237; Mystic Grange, No. 58; Victor Grange, No. 49; Riverside Grange, No. 93; Perry Grange, No. 324; Mountain Grange, No. 331; Wellington Grange, No. 333; Northern Light Grange, No. 6; Mount Etna Grange, No. 36; Golden Harvest Grange, No. 33; Easton Grange, No. 159; North Somerset Grange, No. 218; Orchard Grange, No. 22; Good Cheer Grange, No. 323; Readfield Grange, No. 217; Princeton Grange, No. 293; Eureka Grange, No. 113; Burton Grange, No. 98, and Prospect Grange, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country the election of United States Senators by popular vote; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of Wiggan Grange, No. 410; Pleasant Valley Grange, No. 54; Vassalboro Grange, No. 322; Readfield Grange, No. 217; Victor Grange, No. 49; Mystic Grange, No. 58; Rockemeka Grange, No. 109; Seaside Grange, No. 243; Golden Harvest Grange, No. 33; Sandy River Grange, No. 89; North Star Grange, No. 47; Wesserrunnett Grange, No. 346; Granite Grange, No. 14; Morning Star Grange, No. 50; Eureka Grange, No. 113; Sidney Grange, No. 194; Orchard Grange, No. 309; Round Mountain Grange, No. 162; Central Grange, No. 67; Bingham Grange, No. 237; Cherryfield Grange, No. 256; Bear Mountain Grange, No. 62, and Forest Grange, No. 125, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Maine, praying for the extension of rural free mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Friendship Grange, Riverside Grange; Golden Harvest Grange, No. 33; Orchard Grange, No. 107; Rockemeka Grange, No. 109; North Star Grange, No. 47; Wesserrunnett Grange, No. 346; Readfield Grange, No. 217; Sandy River Grange, No. 89; Vassalboro Grange, No. 322; Forest Grange, No. 125; Cherryfield Grange, No. 256, and Eureka Grange, No. 113, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Maine, praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Victor Grange, No. 49; Mystic Grange, No. 58; Riverside Grange, No. 93; Mountain Grange, No. 331; Perry Grange, No. 324; Northern Light Grange, No. 6; Wellington Grange, No. 333; Anson Grange, No. 88; Orchard Grange, No. 509; Golden Harvest Grange, No. 33; Bingham Grange, No. 237; White Club Grange, No. 182; Helden Grange, No. 47; Eaton

Grange, No. 159; North Somerset Grange, No. 318; South Montville Grange, No. 271; Golden Harvest Grange, No. 39; Lamoine Grange, No. 264; Good Cheer Grange, No. 323; Princeton Grange, No. 293; Readfield Grange, No. 217; Eureka Grange, No. 113; Enterprise Grange, No. 173; Baxter Grange, No. 95, and Mount Etna Grange, No. 36, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of adequate anti-trust laws; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of Sandy River Grange, No. 88; Sidney Grange, No. 194; Cherryfield Grange, No. 256; Orange Grange, No. 309; Saron Jones Grange, No. 276; Victor Grange, No. 49; Granite Grange, No. 14; Golden Rule Grange, No. 150; Eureka Grange, No. 113; Round Mountain Grange, No. 162; Forest Grange, No. 125; North Star Grange, No. 47; Bingham Grange, No. 237; Vassalboro Grange, No. 322, and Wesserrunnett Grange, No. 346, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Maine, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of reservoirs or irrigating canals for the irrigation of arid lands; which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented petitions of Easton Grange, No. 159; Northern Light Grange, No. 6; Enterprise Grange, No. 173; Wellington Grange, No. 333; Mount Etna Grange, No. 36; White Dock Grange, No. 82; Burgham Grange, No. 237; Lamoine Grange, No. 264; Good Cheer Grange, No. 323; South Montville Grange, No. 271; Princeton Grange, No. 293; Readfield Grange, No. 217; Eureka Grange, No. 113; Buxton Grange, No. 45; Lime Grange; Sidney Grange, No. 194; Anson Grange, No. 88; Star Grange; Orchard Grange, No. 109; Golden Harvest Grange, No. 33; Mystic Tie Grange, No. 58; Somerset Grange, No. 28; Victor Grange, No. 49; Riverside Grange, No. 93; Perry Grange, No. 324; and Mountain Grange, No. 131; all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country protection in the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the California State Suffrage Association, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the reorganization of the consular service; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Tulare Grange, No. 198, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tulare, Cal., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oakland, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to allow the wives of converted Chinese to enter the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Mechanics' Institute of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made to prevent the discontinuance of the Hydrographic Branch of the United States Geological Survey; which was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey.

He also presented memorials of the Record, of National City; the Gazette, of Georgetown; the Hyphen, of Monterey; the Guide, of Fresno; the Star, of Dos Palos; the Enterprise, of Compton; the Independent, of Yuba City; the Pioneer, of San Jose; the Blade, of Oceanside; the Chronicle, of Santa Paula; the Exponent, of Reedley; the Tidings, of Los Angeles; the Church Messenger, of Los Angeles; the Mining and Scientific Press, of San Francisco; the Pacific Prohibitionist, the Breeder and Sportsman, the Last Days, the Equity, the Political Record, the News Letter, the Civic and Social Problem, and the American Forest Review, all of San Francisco, in the State of California, and a memorial of the Massey Colleges, of Columbus, Ga., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PROCTOR presented petitions of Glover Grange, No. 272; Boyden Grange, No. 157; Caledonia Grange, No. 19; Eclipse Grange, No. 255, and Mount Anthony Grange, No. 230, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Vermont, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of Caledonia Grange, No. 9; Glover Grange, No. 272; Boyden Grange, No. 157, and Enterprise Grange, No. 255, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Vermont, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of reservoirs or irrigating canals for the irrigation of arid lands; which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

He also presented petitions of Eclipse Grange, No. 255; Glover Grange, No. 212; Mount Anthony Grange, No. 230; Boyden Grange, No. 157, and Caledonia Grange, No. 9, all Patrons of

Husbandry, in the State of Vermont, praying for the extension of rural free mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Eclipse Grange, No. 255; Glover Grange, No. 272; Boyden Grange, No. 157; Mount Anthony Grange, No. 230, and Caledonia Grange, No. 9, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country protection in the use of shoddy in manufactured goods; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of Glover Grange, No. 272; Protection Grange, No. 22; Mount Anthony Grange, No. 230; Maple Valley Grange, No. 270; Eclipse Grange, No. 255; Independent Grange, No. 23; Vernon Grange, No. 298; State Line Grange, No. 253; Missisquoi Grange, No. 257; North Branch Grange, No. 87, and Comfort Grange, No. 110, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of adequate anti-trust laws; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Eclipse Grange, No. 205; Glover Grange, No. 272; Boyden Grange, No. 157; Caledonia Grange, No. 9, and Mount Anthony Grange, No. 230, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Vermont, praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Protective Grange, No. 22; North Branch Grange, No. 87; Independent Grange, No. 23; Vernon Grange, No. 128; Star Grange; Morrisfield Grange, No. 267; State Line Grange, No. 253; Eclipse Grange, No. 255; Caledonia Grange, No. 9; Glover Grange, No. 272; Maple Valley Grange, No. 270; Mount Anthony Grange, No. 230; Wheaton Grange, No. 304, and Missisquoi Valley Grange, No. 259, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country protection in the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of Maple Valley Grange, No. 270; State Line Grange, No. 253; Missisquoi Valley Grange, No. 257; Glover Grange, No. 272; Eclipse Grange, No. 255; North Branch Grange, No. 87; Vernon Grange, No. 228; Independent Grange, No. 23; Protective Grange, No. 22; Mount Anthony Grange, No. 230, and Mascot Grange, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country the election of United States Senators by popular vote; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DAVIS presented petitions of Meadow Vale Grange, No. 582; Wyanette Grange, No. 571; Friendship Grange, No. 566; Spring Vale Grange, No. 576, and Spencer Brook Grange, No. 581, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of Meadow Vale Grange, No. 582; Wyanette Grange, No. 571; Union Grange, No. 869, and Spring Vale Grange, No. 576, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of Meadow Vale Grange, No. 582; Spring Vale Grange, No. 576, and Wyanette Grange, No. 571, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the election of Senators by a popular vote of the people; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of Wyanette Grange, No. 571; Friendship Grange, No. 569; Spring Vale Grange, No. 576, and Meadow Vale Grange, No. 582, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of shoddy in manufactured goods; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of Friendship Grange, No. 566; Wyanette Grange, No. 571; Spring Vale Grange, No. 576; Meadow Vale Grange, No. 582, and Spencer Brook Grange, No. 581, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Meadow Vale Grange, No. 572; Friendship Grange, No. 566; Spring Vale Grange, No. 576; Wyanette Grange, No. 571; Spencer Brook Grange, No. 581; Bethany Grange, No. 748; and Bellfountain Grange, No. 277, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the extension of free rural mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented memorials of Meadow Vale Grange, No. 582; Spencer Brook Grange, No. 581; Spring Vale Grange, No. 576, and Friendship Grange, No. 566, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the construction of reservoirs or irrigating canals for the irrigation of arid lands;

which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation to change from sixty to thirty days the time when the new tariffs shall be posted by carriers previous to the taking effect of the changes; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HOAR presented the memorial of Delia Ryan and 10 other citizens of Milford, Mass., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Joseph E. Haskell and 44 other citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the establishment of an Army veterinary corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Francis E. Willard Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Pittsfield, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors in Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

Mr. SHOUP presented the petition of Mrs. Ida M. Weaver, president, and Miss Frances Wood, secretary, on behalf of the Equal Suffrage Association of Idaho, praying that political equality be granted the women of Hawaii and the other new island possessions; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Jonesboro, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the parcels-post bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Real Estate Board of Chicago, Ill., praying that an appropriation be made for the extension of the pneumatic postal tube system to some of the Western cities; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Catharine Waugh McCulloch, president, and Dr. Julia Holmes Smith, secretary, on behalf of the Equal Suffrage Association of Illinois, praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a petition of the Real Estate Board of Chicago, Ill., praying for the repeal of the documentary stamp tax; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Company G, Sixth Infantry, National State Guard of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the appropriation for the militia of the several States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the officers of the First Cavalry, National State Guard of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the armament of the militia; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Preachers' Meeting of Chicago, Ill., praying for the establishment of free trade with Puerto Rico; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 223, Journeymen Tailors' Union, of Elgin, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect free labor from prison competition, and also to limit the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon the public works of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 171, Typographical Union, of Elgin, Ill., praying that the Public Printer be authorized to print the label of the Allied Printing Trades on all publications of the Government; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented petitions of W. M. Tunner, of Central, via Micanopy, Fla.; the National Cash Register Company, of Dayton, Ohio; the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California; the Board of Trade of Detroit, Mich.; the Michigan State Millers' Association, of Lansing, Mich.; and of the Edward P. Allis Company, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the interstate-commerce law; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. THURSTON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Bloomington, Nebr., remonstrating against the imposition of tariff duties on trade between this country and Puerto Rico; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Post No. 291, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, and a petition of Post No. 118, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the detail of active and retired officers of the Army to enable them to assist in

military instruction in the public schools; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club, of Hastings, Nebr., remonstrating against the leasing of large tracts of the public lands to individuals or corporations; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Overton, Nebr., praying for a continuation of the free distribution by the Department of Agriculture of blackleg vaccine; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the memorial of E. S. Ricker and 1 other citizen of Dawes County, Nebr., remonstrating against the insertion of the word "male" in the suffrage clauses of forms of government recommended for Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, or any other newly acquired possessions; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also presented petitions of the Omaha Guards, of Omaha; of Company B, First Regiment, National State Guard, and of Company H, Second Regiment, National State Guard, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the armament of the militia; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Church of Christ, of Hastings, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors and opium in Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of sundry citizens of Omaha, Nebr., extending sympathy to the Boers in their struggle for independence; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Village Board of Niobrara, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the protection of the banks of the Missouri River at that town; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the establishment of an Army veterinary corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of the News-Herald, of Fairfield; the Saunders County Journal, of Ashland; the Nebraska Teacher, of Lincoln; the Buffalo County Pilot and the Socialist Review, of Kearney; the Nebraska State Democrat, of Lincoln; the Register, of Hebron, and the Enterprise, of Clarks, all in the State of Nebraska, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of W. C. McKicker, bishop coadjutor of Rhode Island, and sundry citizens of Rhode Island; of Mrs. D. M. Brooks and sundry other citizens of Morristown, N. J.; J. G. Schurman and sundry other citizens of Ithaca, N. Y.; Mrs. J. M. Levering and sundry other citizens of Pennsylvania; Mrs. Hamilton S. Gordon and sundry other citizens of New York City; of the Woman's National Indian Association of Meadville, Pa.; of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa.; of the Woman's National Indian Association of Bryn Mawr, Pa.; of the Woman's National Indian Association of Dayton, Ohio; of Mrs. Mary Hawes and sundry other citizens of Bangor, Me.; of the Woman's National Indian Association of Troy, N. Y., and of Frederick Holbrook and sundry other citizens of Brattleboro, Vt., praying for the extension of the classified service in the Indian departments, and for other purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2352) to authorize the judges of the district courts of the United States to appoint stenographic reporters, fix the duties and compensation thereof, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2839) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 794) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

REPORT ON FOOD ADULTERATIONS.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] on the 2d instant, to report it with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Printing was to strike out all after the word "Resolved" and to insert:

That there be printed for the use of the Senate 2,500 copies of Senate Report 516, first session Fifty-sixth Congress, being the report of and testimony taken by the Committee on Manufactures on the adulteration of food products.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does that include the testimony that has been taken recently?

Mr. PLATT of New York. No; it does not.

Mr. COCKRELL. I thought the first resolution—the one proposed to be amended—provided for printing the testimony recently taken.

Mr. PLATT of New York. No; it does not.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the first resolution be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. MASON on the 2d instant, as follows:

Resolved, That 5,000 copies of the testimony taken before the Committee on Manufactures of the Senate relative to adulterated foods, together with the report of the committee submitted thereon, be printed for distribution under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Has that document been already printed?

Mr. PLATT of New York. Yes; it was printed in the usual way, the ordinary number of copies.

Mr. COCKRELL. This is simply for a reprint?

Mr. PLATT of New York. That is all.

Mr. HARRIS. There have been a number of copies of the testimony taken by the committee all during the summer and fall printed for the use of the committee, but not the number prescribed here, that are desired for distribution. The committee was engaged all during last summer and fall and even during a part of this winter in taking testimony.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is exactly what I wanted to know. I have had applications for copies of the report and the testimony.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand it, the resolution proposes to have additional copies printed for the use of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Of the pending report?

Mr. HARRIS. Of the pending report—the report of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Printing.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 3663) authorizing and requiring the Metropolitan Railroad Company to extend its lines on old Sixteenth street; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3664) to regulate the transportation of prisoners, to provide a separate court for children, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MORGAN introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 3665) for the relief of W. H. Ketchum, of Mobile, Ala.;

A bill (S. 3666) for the relief of Calvin S. Hill;

A bill (S. 3667) for the relief of the estate of Alexander F. Perryman, deceased; and

A bill (S. 3668) for the relief of Cornila Till.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 3669) granting an increase of pension to Ariana F. Wills; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 3670) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to the heir or heirs of one Tawamnoha, or Martha Crayon, conveying to them certain lands in the State of North Dakota, confirming certain conveyances thereof, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. KENNEY introduced a bill (S. 3671) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Shilling; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 3672) to provide for the allotment of certain lands to Indian children, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 3673) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Stockholm;

A bill (S. 3674) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Collins;

A bill (S. 3675) granting an increase of pension to Hynes Woodring;

A bill (S. 3676) granting a pension to Erwin R. Cole (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3677) granting a pension to C. A. Craig; and

A bill (S. 3678) granting an increase of pension to Rollan Prence.

Mr. WETMORE introduced a bill (S. 3679) granting a deed of quitclaim and release to Lorillard Spencer, his heirs and assigns, of all the right, title, and interest in and to certain land in the city of Newport, R. I.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PRITCHARD introduced a bill (S. 3680) granting a pension to Mary Elizabeth Moore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 3681) providing for the payment of the award of the Secretary of the Interior in favor of the Cherokees, made under the provision of the act of Congress of March 3, 1893; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 3682) for the relief of Eli Frasier; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 3683) to increase the pensions of widows of the Mexican war soldiers and sailors to \$16 per month; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3684) for the relief of the owners of certain cotton shipped from Natchez, Miss., in August, 1863, on the steamer *Gladiator*; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 3685) to amend the seventh section of the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 105) to establish and fix the rank of the Commanding General and of the Adjutant-General of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BAKER introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 106) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to certify lands to the State of Kansas for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas submitted an amendment providing for the appointment of a commission in each town in the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Cherokee nations of Indians, to consist of one member to be appointed by the executive of such nation, one member to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and one member to be selected by the town or city council, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

GOVERNMENT OF PUERTO RICO.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes. I ask that the amendment lie on the table and be printed.

I desire to give notice that on next Thursday, at the conclusion of the morning business, I shall submit some remarks on the same and upon the pending legislation.

The amendment was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

Amend section 10 so as to read as follows:
"SEC. 10. All articles coming into the United States from Puerto Rico, or going into Puerto Rico from the United States, shall be admitted free of duty; but this act shall not be construed as extending the Constitution of the United States, or any part thereof, over Puerto Rico, and it is hereby declared that the Constitution of the United States is not extended over Puerto Rico."

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. THURSTON. I present hearings taken before the Committee on Indian Affairs and the subcommittee having in charge the Indian appropriation bill. I move that the hearings be printed as a document for the use of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

LOAN OF NAVAL EQUIPMENT TO MILITARY SCHOOLS.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1023) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to loan naval equipment to certain military schools.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 12, after the word "for," to insert "conducting upon some body of water suitable for such drills;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, upon the application of the governor of any State having seacoast line or bordering on one or more of the Great Lakes, to direct the Secretary of the Navy to furnish to one well-established military school in that State desiring to afford its cadets instruction in elementary seamanship one fully equipped man-of-war's cutter for every 20 cadets in actual attendance and such other equipment as may be spared and be deemed adequate for instruction in elementary seamanship: *Provided*, That the said school shall have adequate facilities for conducting upon some body of water suitable for such drills cutter drill and shall have in actual attendance at least 150 cadets in uniform receiving military instruction and quartered in barracks under military regulation, and shall have the capacity to quarter and educate at the same time 150 cadets: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy shall require a bond in each case, in double the value of the property for the care and safe-keeping thereof and for the return of the same when required.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have just a short explanation of the bill, and while that explanation is being made to have such order in the Senate that we can hear it.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The bill simply authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to furnish to schools founded for naval instruction men-of-war's cutters, of which there is a considerable surplus in the Navy Department, the cutters to be used for educating the cadets; instructing them, in the language of the bill, in elementary seamanship.

Mr. COCKRELL. The very point I wanted to know was whether the cutters would have to be built for this purpose or whether they are already in existence and are simply to be loaned.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. They are already in existence. It has been the custom for years to loan them to military institutions. There is a very large military academy in Indiana which can not, under existing law, avail itself of the privileges which other schools enjoy. This bill simply authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to put schools similarly situated to that upon the same footing as all other military or naval schools. The school in Indiana is located on an interior lake, and under existing law the power to permit the use of the cutters is restricted to schools which are located upon the Great Lakes or in States having a seacoast line.

Mr. COCKRELL. How would the cutter, if it is an interior lake, be gotten there?

Mr. FAIRBANKS. They are but small boats, only about 20 feet long, and can be hauled readily on railroad cars. They are comparatively small boats.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8347) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that as the reading of the bill proceeds the amendments made by the committee may be acted upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with; that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first acted upon. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The order is made.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Clerks and messengers to committees," on page 5, line 7, after the word "Retrenchment," to insert "Enrolled Bills, Geological Survey, Railroads, Pacific Railroads, Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico, Philippines, Relations with Cuba, Interoceanic Canals;" in line 12, after the words "Woman Suffrage," to insert "and;" in line 13, after the word "Mining," to strike out "and Construction of Nicaragua Canal;" and in line 16, before the word "dollars," to strike out "two thousand two hundred and twenty" and insert "seventeen thousand eight hundred and sixty;" so as to make the clause read:

Clerks to the Committees on Naval Affairs, Census, Public Lands, Indian Affairs, to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Public Buildings and Grounds, Agriculture and Forestry, Education and Labor, Territories, Interstate Commerce, Public Health and National Quarantine, Private Land Claims, Patents, Coast Defenses, Privileges and Elections, Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress, Rules, Civil Service and Retrenchment, Enrolled Bills, Geological Survey, Railroads, Pacific Railroads, Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico, Philippines, Relations with Cuba, Interoceanic Canals, and clerk to conference minority of the Senate, at \$2,220

each; clerks to committees on Woman Suffrage and Mines and Mining, at \$2,100 each; in all, \$117,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 17, before the word "clerks," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-two," and in line 19, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty-five thousand" and insert "thirty-nine thousand six hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For 22 clerks to committees, at \$1,800 each, \$39,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Office of Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper," on page 6, line 20, to increase the number of laborers from 25 to 41, and in line 24, to increase the total appropriation for "Office of Sergeant-at-Arms and Doorkeeper" from \$125,224 to \$136,744.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 10, to reduce the number of annual clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees from 35 to 30, and in line 12, to reduce the appropriation for annual clerks to Senators who are not chairmen of committees from \$52,500 to \$45,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "For contingent expenses," on page 9, line 3, to increase the appropriation for folding speeches and pamphlets from \$4,000 to \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 13, to increase the appropriation for miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, from \$25,000 to \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 1, to increase the appropriation for repairs of Maltby Building from \$1,000 to \$2,000. The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Congressional Directory," on page 11, line 2, before the words "Joint Committee," to strike out "present;" so as to make the clause read:

For expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, to be expended under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 14, line 3, after the word "Pensions," to insert "Insular Affairs," and in line 7, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty-five" and insert "fifty-seven;" so as to make the clause read:

Clerks and messengers to committees: For clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$1,600; messenger, \$1,200; janitor, \$720; clerk to the Committee on Appropriations, \$3,000; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,000; messenger and assistant clerk, \$1,200; clerks to Committees on Accounts, Agriculture, Banking and Currency, Claims, District of Columbia, Elections, Foreign Affairs, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Indian Affairs, Invalid Pensions, Judiciary, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Post-Office and Post-Roads, Public Buildings and Grounds, Public Lands, Rivers and Harbors, War Claims, Pensions, Insular Affairs, and clerk to continue Digest of Claims under resolution of March 7, 1888, at \$2,000 each; and for assistant clerk to the Committee on War Claims, \$1,200; in all, \$57,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Library of Congress," on page 20, line 13, to strike out "Executive department" and insert "General administration;" in line 14, before the word "thousand," to strike out "five" and insert "six;" in line 17, before the word "hundred," to strike out "nine" and insert "one thousand two," and in line 20, before the word "hundred," to strike out "fourteen thousand six" and insert "fifteen thousand nine;" so as to make the clause read:

General administration: For Librarian of Congress, \$6,000; chief assistant librarian, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; Librarian's secretary, \$1,500; one clerk, \$1,200; one assistant messenger, \$720; in all, \$15,920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 21, to strike out "superintendent" and insert "assistant in charge;" so as to make the clause read:

Mail and supply: For assistant in charge, \$1,200; one assistant, \$900; one messenger boy, \$360; in all, \$2,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 3, to strike out "superintendent of department" and insert "chief of division;" in line 5, after the word "dollars," to insert "1 assistant, \$1,200;" in line 6, before the word "assistants," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" in line 7, after the word "each," to strike out "1 assistant, \$600," and insert "2 assistants, at \$720 each; 2 assistants, at \$800 each; 1 assistant, \$520," and in line 12, before the word "dollars," to strike out "six thousand six hundred and twenty" and insert "eleven thousand two hundred and eighty;" so as to make the clause read:

Order (purchasing): For chief of division, \$2,000; 1 assistant, \$1,500; 1 assistant, \$1,200; 3 assistants, at \$900 each; 2 assistants, at \$720 each; 2 assistants, at \$800 each; 1 assistant, \$520; and 2 messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$11,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 13, to strike out "catalogue department" and insert "division;" in line 15, before the word "assistants," to strike out "four" and insert "five;" in line 16, before the word "assistants," to strike out "five" and insert "six;" in line 17, before the word "assistants," to strike out "nine" and insert "eleven;" in line 18, before the word "assistants," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" in line 19, after the word "each," to insert "1 assistant, \$600;" in line 20, before the word "assistants," to strike out "five" and insert "ten;" in line 21, after the word "six," to strike out "messenger boys" and insert "messengers," and in line 24, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-three thousand seven hundred and twenty" and insert "forty-two thousand two hundred and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

Catalogue and shelf: For chief of division, \$3,000; 2 assistants, at \$1,800 each; 5 assistants, at \$1,500 each; 6 assistants, at \$1,200 each; 11 assistants, at \$900 each; 4 assistants, at \$720 each; 1 assistant, \$600; 10 assistants, at \$540 each; 6 messengers, at \$360 each; in all, \$42,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 4, after the word "of," to strike out "department" and insert "division;" in line 5, before the word "dollars," to insert "five hundred;" in line 6, after the word "dollars," to strike out "1 assistant, \$900" and insert "2 assistants, at \$900 each;" and in line 10, before the word "hundred," to strike out "five thousand one" and insert "six thousand five;" so as to make the clause read:

Bibliography: For chief of division, \$2,500; 1 assistant, \$1,200; 2 assistants, at \$900 each; 1 assistant, \$720; and 1 messenger boy, \$360; in all, \$6,580.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 12, after the word "for," to strike out "assistant librarian (superintendent of reading room)" and insert "superintendent of reading room;" in line 17, before the word "dollars," to strike out "nine hundred" and insert "one thousand;" and on page 23, line 5, before the word "hundred," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" so as to make the clause read:

Reading rooms (including evening service) and special collections: For superintendent of reading room, \$3,000; 2 assistants, at \$1,500 each; 4 assistants, at \$1,200 each; 1 assistant (reading room for the blind), \$1,000; 5 assistants, at \$900 each; 10 assistants, at \$720 each; evening service: 5 assistants, at \$900 each; 15 assistants, at \$720 each; 1 attendant, Senate reading room, \$900; 1 attendant, Representatives' reading room, \$900; 1 attendant, Representatives' reading room, \$720; 2 attendants, cloak rooms, \$720 each; 1 attendant, Toner Library, \$900; 1 attendant, Washingtonian Library, \$900; four messenger boys, at \$360 each; 2 watchmen, at \$720 each; in all, \$47,440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 6, after the word "For," to strike out "superintendent" and insert "chief of division;" in line 7, after the word "dollars," to insert "chief assistant, \$1,500;" in line 11, after the word "each," to insert "for arrears of assorting and collating and to enable periodical reading room to be open in the evening, 2 assistants, at \$720 each;" and in line 15, before the word "dollars," to strike out "six thousand six hundred and eighty" and insert "nine thousand six hundred and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

Periodical (including evening service): For chief of division, \$2,000; chief assistant, \$1,500; 2 assistants, at \$900 each; 3 assistants, at \$720 each; 2 messenger boys, at \$360 each; for arrears of assorting and collating and to enable periodical reading room to be open in the evening, 2 assistants, at \$720 each; in all, \$9,620.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 15, to insert:

Documents: For chief of division, \$3,000; 1 assistant, \$1,200; 1 assistant, \$720; 1 messenger, \$360; in all, \$5,280.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 21, after the word "For," to strike out "superintendent, one thousand five hundred" and insert "chief of division, two thousand;" in line 22, after the word "dollars," to strike out "2 assistants, at \$720 each" and insert "1 assistant, \$1,200; 1 assistant, \$900;" and on page 24, line 2, before the word "dollars," to strike out "three thousand, three hundred" and insert "four thousand four hundred and sixty;" so as to make the clause read:

Manuscript: For chief of division, \$2,000; 1 assistant, \$1,200; 1 assistant, \$900; 1 messenger boy, \$360; in all, \$4,460.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 3, after the word "For," to strike out "superintendent" and insert "chief of division;" in line 4, before the word "dollars," to insert "two hundred and fifty;" in line 6, after the word "each," to insert "1 assistant, \$720;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "five thousand three hundred and sixty" and insert "six thousand three hundred and thirty;" so as to make the clause read:

Maps and charts: For chief of division, \$2,250; 1 assistant, \$1,200; 2 assistants, at \$900 each; 1 assistant, \$720; 1 messenger boy, \$360; in all, \$6,330.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 10, after the word "For," to strike out "superintendent" and insert "chief of division;" in line 11, after the word "dollars," to insert "1 assistant,

\$1,200;" and in line 15, before the word "hundred," to strike out "four thousand three" and insert "five thousand five," so as to make the clause read:

Music: For chief of division, \$1,500; 1 assistant, \$1,200; 1 assistant, \$1,000; 2 assistants, at \$720 each; 1 messenger boy, \$360; in all, \$5,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 16, after the word "For," to strike out "superintendent" and insert "chief of division;" in line 17, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "one assistant, \$1,200;" in line 18, before the word "assistants," to strike out "three" and insert "two;" in the same line, after the word "each," to insert "one messenger, \$360," and in line 21, before the word "dollars," to strike out "four thousand seven hundred" and insert "six thousand three hundred and sixty;" so as to make the clause read:

Prints: For chief of division, \$3,000; one assistant, \$1,200; two assistants, at \$900 each; one messenger, \$360; in all, \$6,360.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 24, after the word "dollars," to insert "one messenger, \$720," and on page 25, line 2, before the word "dollars," to strike out "and sixty" and insert "seven hundred and eighty;" so as to make the clause read:

Smithsonian deposit: For custodian, \$1,500; one assistant, \$1,200; one messenger, \$720; one messenger boy, \$360; in all, \$3,780.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 3, after the word "For," to strike out "superintendent" and insert "custodian;" so as to make the clause read:

Congressional Reference Library: For custodian, \$1,500; one assistant, \$1,200; one assistant, \$900; one assistant, \$720; two messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$5,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 9, after the word "For," to strike out "superintendent" and insert "custodian;" so as to make the clause read:

Law Library: For custodian, \$2,500; 2 assistants, at \$1,400 each; 1 messenger, \$900; in all, \$6,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 18, after the word "Copyright," to strike out "Department" and insert "Office;" so as to make the clause read:

Copyright Office, under the direction of the Librarian of Congress: Register of copyrights, \$3,000; 4 clerks, at \$1,800 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,600 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,400 each; 9 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 8 clerks, at \$900 each; 7 clerks, at \$720 each; 1 clerk, \$600; 1 messenger boy, \$360, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 9, to insert:

For special, temporary, and miscellaneous service, at the discretion of the Librarian, to be available immediately and continue available until expended, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 13, after the word "Congress," to strike out "For purchase of books for the Library, thirty-five" and insert:

For purchase of books for the Library, and for freight, commissions, and traveling expenses incidental to the acquisition of books by purchase, gift, or exchange, fifty;

So as to make the clause read:

Increase of Library of Congress: For purchase of books for the Library, and for freight, commissions, and traveling expenses incidental to the acquisition of books by purchase, gift, or exchange, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 20, to increase the appropriation for purchase of law books for the Library, under the direction of the Chief Justice, from \$2,500 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 4, to increase the appropriation for purchase of periodicals, serials, and newspapers from \$2,500 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 5, to increase the total appropriation for purchase of books for the Library of Congress from \$43,180 to \$61,180.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 6, to strike out: For contingent expenses of the Library, stationery, supplies, traveling expenses, postage, transportation, and miscellaneous items, \$4,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

For miscellaneous and contingent expenses of the Library, stationery, supplies, and all stock and materials directly purchased, miscellaneous traveling expenses, postage, transportation, and all incidental expenses connected with the administration of the Library and the copyright office, \$8,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 21, to increase the appropriation for chief clerk under the superintendent of the Library building and grounds from \$2,000 to \$2,220; and on page 28, line 19, to increase the total appropriation for the "Custody,

care, and maintenance of Library building and grounds" from \$67,065 to \$67,285.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 19, to insert:

To enable the superintendent to employ during the last quarter of the fiscal year 1900 such of the additional employees as are herein provided for the custody, care, and maintenance of the Library building and grounds for the fiscal year 1901, and at the rates of compensation prescribed, \$803.25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 9, to increase the appropriation for furniture, including partitions, screens, and shelving, from \$30,000 to \$45,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Botanic Garden," on page 29, line 15, after the word "trees," to strike out "and shrubs, and for labor and material" and to insert, "shrubs, plants, seeds, and for services, materials, miscellaneous supplies, and contingent expenses;" so as to make the clause read:

For procuring manure, tools, fuel, purchasing trees, shrubs, plants, seeds, and for services, materials, miscellaneous supplies, and contingent expenses in connection with repairs and improvements to Botanic Garden, under direction of the Joint Library Committee of Congress, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Executive," on page 29, after line 23, to insert:

For compensation of the President of the Senate, in addition to his salary as Senator, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 6, to increase the number of clerks of class 4, in the office of the President of the United States, from 4 to 5; in line 7, to reduce the number of clerks of class 3, in the same office, from 2 to 1; and in line 15 to increase the total appropriation from \$48,340 to \$48,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Civil Service Commission," on page 31, line 12, after the word "watchman," to insert "2 messenger boys, at \$360 each;" and in line 14, before the word "dollars," to strike out "ninety-one thousand three hundred and forty" and insert "ninety-two thousand and sixty;" so as to make the clause read:

For 3 Commissioners, at \$3,500 each; chief examiner, \$3,000; secretary, \$2,000; 8 clerks of class 4; 10 clerks of class 3; 13 clerks of class 2; 15 clerks of class 1; 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 2 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 messenger; 2 laborers; engineer, \$840; 2 watchmen; 2 messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$92,060.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under head of "Department of State," on page 31, line 23, to increase the salary of the Second and Third Assistant Secretaries from \$4,000 each to \$4,500 each, and on page 32, line 11, to increase the total appropriation from \$134,670 to \$135,670.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 15, to increase the appropriation for books and maps and books for the library, Department of State, from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 16, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of State to purchase for the library of the Department of State books and manuscripts, including a collection of books and pamphlets bearing upon the history of the war of the Revolution, formerly in the library of Gen. Sir Henry Clinton, commander in chief of the British forces in America during that period, the same having been richly annotated in his hand, \$1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 24, to insert:

For restoring, binding, and publishing indices of manuscript archives on file in the Department of State, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department, division of bookkeeping and warrants," on page 36, line 2, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assistant chief of division from \$2,400 to \$2,700; and in line 9, to increase the total appropriation for the division of bookkeeping and warrants from \$67,170 to \$67,470.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Treasury Department, division of appointments," page 36, line 24, to increase the number of "clerks at \$900 each" from 4 to 5; and on page 37, line 1, to increase the total appropriation for the division of appointments from \$36,410 to \$37,310.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 14, before the word "of," to strike out "2 clerks" and insert "1 clerk;" and in line 16, before the word "hundred," to strike out "twelve thousand nine" and insert "eleven thousand seven;" so as to make the clause read:

Miscellaneous division: For chief of division, \$2,500; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; 1 clerk of class 4; 1 clerk of class 3; 1 clerk of class 1; clerk, \$1,000; clerk, \$900; and one assistant messenger; in all, \$11,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 19, after the word "dollars," to insert "assistant chief of division, \$2,000;" in line 20, before the word "clerks," to strike out "four" and insert "three;" and on page 39, line 2, before the word "hundred," to strike out "thirty-two thousand nine" and insert "thirty-three thousand one;" so as to make the clause read:

Division of stationery, printing, and blanks: For chief of division, \$2,500; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; 3 clerks of class 4; 3 clerks of class 3; 3 clerks of class 2; 1 clerk of class 1; 2 clerks, at \$900 each; 2 messengers; 2 assistant messengers; foreman of bindery, at \$5 per day; 4 binders, at \$4 per day each; and 2 sewers and folders, at \$2.50 per day each; in all, \$33,158.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 23, before the word "of," to strike out "1 clerk" and insert "2 clerks;" in the same line, after the word "four," to strike out "1 clerk of class 3;" in line 23, after the word "two," to insert "2 clerks of class 1;" and in line 24, before the word "hundred," to strike out "ten thousand eight" and insert "thirteen thousand four;" so as to make the clause read:

Offices of disbursing clerks: For 2 disbursing clerks, at \$2,500 each; 2 clerks of class 4; 1 clerk of class 2; 2 clerks of class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,000; in all, \$13,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 15, after the word "one," to strike out "and for 4 additional clerks of class 1;" in line 19, before the word "hundred," to strike out "twenty-five thousand seven" and insert "twenty thousand nine;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of Auditor for Treasury Department: For Auditor, \$4,000; Deputy Auditor, \$2,500; law clerk, \$2,000; four chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; 17 clerks of class 4; 13 clerks of class 3; 10 clerks of class 2; 20 clerks of class 1; 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 3 clerks, at \$900 each; 3 assistant messengers; 4 laborers; and for continuing 3 clerks of class 1 rendered necessary by increased work incident to the war with Spain; in all, \$120,900.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that those amendments be disagreed to. I find on further examination that the amount proposed to be appropriated by the House of Representatives ought to be allowed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be disagreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 46, line 8, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "four;" in line 11, after the word "pressman," to strike out "at \$3.20 per day" and insert "\$1,200;" and in line 12, after the word "and," to strike out "ninety-three thousand three hundred and one dollars and sixty cents" and insert "ninety-four thousand three hundred dollars;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Treasurer: For Treasurer of the United States, \$6,000; Assistant Treasurer, \$3,600; cashier, \$3,600; assistant cashier, \$3,200; chief clerk, \$2,500; 5 chiefs of division, at \$2,500 each; vault clerk, \$2,500; principal bookkeeper, \$2,500; assistant bookkeeper, \$2,100; 2 tellers, at \$2,500 each; 2 assistant tellers, at \$2,250 each; clerk for the Treasurer, \$1,800; 25 clerks of class 4; 17 clerks of class 3; 14 clerks of class 2; coin clerk, \$1,400; 23 clerks of class 1; 11 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 52 clerks, at \$900 each; 22 expert counters, at \$720 each; 9 clerks, at \$700 each; mail messenger, \$840; 6 messengers; 6 assistant messengers; 23 laborers; 7 charwomen; 4 pressmen, at \$1,400 each; 8 separators, at \$660 each; 7 feeders, at \$660 each; 1 compositor and pressman, \$1,200; in all, \$294,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the "Office of the Register of the Treasury," on page 47, line 5, to increase the number of clerks of class 1 from 3 to 7; in line 6, to reduce the number of clerks at \$900 each from 24 to 20; and in line 9 to increase the total appropriation for the office of the Register of the Treasury from \$65,170 to \$66,370.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 18, after the word "thousand," to insert "six hundred;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "to be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury;" on page 49, line 4, before the word "clerks," to strike out "thirteen" and insert "twenty-two;" in line 5, before the word "clerks," to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty;" and in line 7, before the word "hundred," to strike out "one" and insert "seven;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue: For Commissioner of Internal Revenue, \$6,000; deputy commissioner, \$4,000; additional deputy commissioner during the fiscal year 1901, \$3,600, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury; chemist, \$2,500; 2 heads of divisions, at \$2,500 each; 4 heads of divisions, at \$2,250 each; 2 additional heads of divisions during the fiscal year 1901, at \$2,250 each; superintendent of stamp vault, \$2,000; stenographer, \$1,800; 24 clerks of class 4; 24 clerks of class 3; 34 clerks of class 2; 24 clerks of class 1; 22 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 30 clerks, at \$900 each; 2 messengers; 14 assistant messengers, and 13 laborers; in all, \$205,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the "Office of Life-Saving Service," on page 50, line 7, to increase the number of clerks of "class 4" from 3 to 4; and in line 12, to increase the total appropriation for the Office of Life-Saving Service from \$40,980 to \$42,780.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 5, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the officer in charge of the Bureau of Statistics from \$3,000 to \$3,500; and in line 14, to increase the

total appropriation for the Bureau of Statistics from \$49,050 to \$49,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 18, to increase the appropriation "for payment of the services of experts, and for other necessary expenditures connected with the collection of facts relative to the internal and foreign commerce of the United States," from \$2,000 to \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the "Office of the Director of the Mint," on page 53, line 4, to increase appropriation for the salary of "one assistant in laboratory" from \$1,000 to \$1,200; and in line 5, to increase the total appropriation for the Office of the Director of the Mint from \$29,360 to \$29,560.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Collecting internal revenue," on page 59, line 10, to insert:

Provided, That the compensation of the chief of the internal-revenue agents shall not exceed \$10 per day, and of the other agents not exceeding \$7 per day each; and for per diem in lieu of subsistence, when absent on duty from their legal residence, said agents shall receive, at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not exceeding \$3 per day.

In line 22, after the word "appointed," to insert "the same as if assigned to regular duty;" and on page 60, line 1, after the word "appointed," to insert:

And the order of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue transferring gaugers, storekeeper-gaugers, or storekeepers to special work shall be accepted by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department as full authority for proper expenses incurred by said gaugers, storekeeper-gaugers, or storekeepers while so assigned.

So as to make the clause read:

For salaries and expenses of agents, fees and expenses of gaugers, salaries and expenses of storekeepers and storekeeper-gaugers, and miscellaneous expenses, \$1,900,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of the chief of the internal-revenue agents shall not exceed \$10 per day and of the other agents not exceeding \$7 per day each; and for per diem in lieu of subsistence, when absent on duty from their legal residence, said agents shall receive, at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not exceeding \$3 per day: *Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized to detail gaugers, storekeeper-gaugers, and storekeepers, appointed in one district, for special or regular duty in other districts, and the accounts of gaugers, storekeeper-gaugers, and storekeepers so detailed shall be adjusted and paid in the district where they are appointed the same as if assigned to regular duty, without regard to the number of districts in which they may have been employed in any one month, the same as if all their services had been performed and expenses incurred in the district in which appointed, and the order of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue transferring gaugers, storekeeper-gaugers, or storekeepers to special work shall be accepted by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department as full authority for proper expenses incurred by said gaugers, storekeeper-gaugers, or storekeepers, while so assigned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Independent Treasury," on page 65, line 14, before the word "assistant," to strike out "two," and insert "three;" in line 16, after the word "each," to strike out "assistant bookkeeper, \$1,000;" in line 20, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seven hundred and twenty," and insert "nine hundred;" and in line 23, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-seven thousand eight hundred and sixty," and insert "twenty-eight thousand four hundred and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of assistant treasurer at St. Louis: For assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier and chief clerk, \$2,500; first teller, \$2,000; second teller, \$1,800; third teller, \$1,600; fourth teller, \$1,200; bookkeeper, \$1,500; 3 assistant bookkeepers, and coin teller, at \$1,200 each; two clerks, at \$1,200 each; assistant coin teller, stenographer and typewriter, and messenger, at \$1,000 each; 2 day watchmen, and coin counters, at \$900 each; night watchman, \$720; and janitor, \$600; in all, \$28,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 13, before the word "hundred," to strike out "five" and insert "eight;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert:

One clerk, \$1,600; 1 clerk, \$1,500; 1 clerk, \$1,400.

And in line 17, before the word "dollars," to strike out "five thousand two hundred" and insert "ten thousand;" so as to make the clause read:

Assay office at Seattle, Wash.: For assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, \$2,500; chief clerk, \$1,800; 1 clerk, \$1,600; 1 clerk, \$1,500; 1 clerk, \$1,400; 1 clerk, \$1,200; in all, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government in the Territories," on page 72, line 23, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" in the same line, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" in line 23, after the word "attorney," to insert "\$4,000;" on page 73, line 4, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-one thousand" and insert "thirty-four thousand five hundred;" and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Provided, That the said commissioners shall report to the Attorney-General on or before November, 1900, the amount of all fees earned for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1901.

So as to make the clause read:

Territory of Alaska: For governor, \$4,000; judge, \$4,000; attorney, \$4,000; marshal and clerk, at \$2,500 each; 10 commissioners, one of whom shall reside

at Kadiak, and one of whom shall reside in Forty Mile mining district, in the district of Alaska, at \$1,000 each; 10 deputy marshals, at \$750 each; in all, \$34,500: *Provided*, That the said commissioners shall report to the Attorney-General on or before November, 1900, the amount of all fees earned for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1901.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 13, before the word "dollars," to strike out "two thousand six hundred" and insert "three thousand;" and in line 17, before the word "hundred," to strike out "sixteen thousand nine" and insert "seventeen thousand three;" so as to make the clause read:

Territory of Arizona: For governor, \$3,000; chief justice and 3 associate judges, at \$3,000 each; secretary, \$1,800; interpreter and translator in the executive office, \$500; in all, \$17,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 2, to insert:

For moving furniture, records of Territory of Arizona, fitting up offices, new capitol building, and necessary expenses of such moving, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 7, to increase the appropriation for the salary of governor of the Territory of New Mexico from \$2,600 to \$3,000; and in line 11, before the word "hundred," to increase the total appropriation for the Territory of New Mexico, from \$19,900 to \$20,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 23, to increase the appropriation for the salary of governor of the Territory of Oklahoma, from \$2,600 to \$3,000; and on page 75, line 2, to increase the total appropriation for the Territory of Oklahoma from \$19,400 to \$19,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "War Department, Office of the Secretary," on page 76, line 5, to increase the number of chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each, from 3 to 4; in line 9, to reduce the number of clerks of class 4 from 5 to 4; and in line 17, to increase the total appropriation for "Office of the Secretary" from \$103,950 to \$104,150.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 78, line 20, after the word "For," to insert "chief clerk, \$2,000;" in line 21, before the word "of," to strike out "2 clerks" and insert "1 clerk;" and in line 22, before the word "hundred," to strike out "three" and insert "five," so as to make the clause read:

Signal Office: For chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 clerk of class 4; 1 clerk of class 1; 1 messenger; 1 laborer; in all, \$6,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the "Office of the Quartermaster-General," on page 79, line 10, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the assistant draftsman from \$1,200 to \$1,400; and in line 13 to increase the total appropriation for Office of the Quartermaster-General from \$153,340 to \$153,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Public Buildings and Grounds," on page 84, line 10, after the word expenses," to insert:

Including purchase of professional and scientific books and periodicals, books of reference, blank books, photographs, and maps.

So as to make the clause read:

For contingent and incidental expenses, including purchase of professional and scientific books and periodicals, books of reference, blank books, photographs, and maps, \$700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 13, to strike out:

Of the foregoing amounts appropriated under "Public buildings and grounds," the sum of \$27,130 shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "State, War, and Navy Department building," on page 85, line 7, after the word "items," to insert "including city directories;" so as to make the clause read:

For fuel, lights, repairs, and miscellaneous items, including city directories, \$38,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Navy Department," on page 85, line 13, after the word "one," to strike out "1 clerk, \$1,000" and insert "2 clerks, at \$1,000 each;" and in line 22, before the word "thousand," to strike out "forty-six" and insert "forty-seven;" so as to make the clause read:

NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of the Secretary of the Navy, \$8,000; Assistant Secretary of the Navy, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$2,500; clerk to the Secretary, \$2,250; disbursing clerk, \$2,250; 4 clerks of class 4; 1 clerk of class 3; stenographer, \$1,800; 1 clerk of class 2; 4 clerks of class 1; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; telegraph operator, \$1,000; carpenter, \$900; 2 messengers; 4 assistant messengers; 4 laborers; in all, \$47,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 2, after the word "For," to insert:

A solicitor, to be an assistant to the Judge-Advocate of the Navy, and to perform the duties of that officer in case of his death, resignation, absence, or sickness, \$2,500.

And in line 9, before the word "hundred," to strike out "twelve thousand three" and insert "fourteen thousand eight;" so as to make the clause read:

Judge-Advocate-General, United States Navy: For a solicitor, to be an assistant to the Judge-Advocate of the Navy, and to perform the duties of that officer in case of his death, resignation, absence, or sickness, \$2,500; chief clerk, \$2,000; 2 clerks of class 4; 1 clerk of class 3; 1 clerk of class 2; 1 clerk of class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,000; 1 clerk, \$900; and 1 laborer; in all, \$14,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 25, after the word "dollars," to insert "1 clerk of class 4;" in the same line, before the word "of," to strike out "1 clerk" and insert "2 clerks;" and on page 88, line 4, before the word "hundred," to strike out "eight thousand eight" and insert "twelve thousand two;" so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Equipment: For chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 clerk of class 4; 2 clerks of class 2; 1 clerk of class 2; one clerk of class 1; 1 copyist; 1 assistant messenger; 1 messenger boy, \$300, and one laborer; in all, \$12,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 9, after the word "For," to insert "hydrographic engineer;" in line 10, after the word "computers," to insert "lithographers;" in line 11, after the word "archives," to insert "compiler;" in the same line, after the word "apprentices," to insert "helpers;" in line 14, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-three thousand five hundred and forty" and insert "ninety-five thousand four hundred and eighteen;" and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to strike out:

And no other fund appropriated shall be used in payment for such or similar services in the Hydrographic Office;

So as to make the clause read:

For hydrographic engineer, draftsmen, engravers, assistants, nautical experts, computers, lithographers, custodian of archives, compiler, copyists, copperplate printers, apprentices, helpers, and laborers in the Hydrographic Office, \$95,418.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, to reduce the appropriation "For purchase of copper plates, steel plates, chart paper, packing boxes, chart portfolios," etc., in the Hydrographic Office from \$12,000 to \$7,000; and in line 7, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Provided, That Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress shall each be entitled to not more than ten charts published by the Hydrographic Office for each regular session of Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 13, to increase the appropriation "For rent of building and rooms, repairs and heating of the same," etc., in the Hydrographic Office, from \$1,500 to \$2,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, line 23, after the word "establish," to insert "and for the establishment of branch offices at Galveston, and Manila, Philippine Islands;" and in line 25, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "thirty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

Contingent expenses of branch offices at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Savannah, New Orleans, San Francisco, Portland (Oreg.), Portland (Me.), Chicago, Cleveland, Port Townsend, Buffalo, Duluth, and Sault Ste. Marie, including furniture, fuel, lights, rent and care of offices, carfare and ferriage in visiting merchant vessels, freight and express charges, telegrams, and other necessary expenses incurred in collecting the latest information for the Pilot Chart, and for other purposes for which the offices were established, and for the establishment of branch offices at Galveston, and Manila, Philippine Islands, \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, line 13, to reduce the appropriation "For a monthly Pilot Chart of the North Pacific Ocean," etc., from \$3,760 to \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 13, to strike out:

No expenditure shall be incurred or authorized for personal services or otherwise under the Hydrographic Office during the fiscal year 1901 except as herein authorized by appropriations under the Navy Department or under appropriations that may be made for printing and binding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 9, to increase the appropriation "For miscellaneous computations in the Naval Observatory" from \$3,200 to \$5,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 2, before the word "copyists," to strike out "fifty-eight" and insert "fifty-nine;" in line 6, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Librarian for the law library of the General Land Office, to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior wholly with reference to his special fitness for such work, \$1,000.

And in line 11, before the word "hundred," to strike out "ninety-seven thousand seven" and insert "ninety-nine thousand six;" so as to make the clause read:

General Land Office: For the Commissioner of the General Land Office, \$5,000; Assistant Commissioner, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be authorized to sign such letters, papers, and documents and to perform such other duties as may be directed by the Commissioner, and shall act as Commissioner in the absence of that officer or in case of a vacancy in the office of Commissioner, \$3,500; chief clerk, \$2,250; 2 law clerks, at \$2,200 each; 3 inspectors of surveyors-general and district land offices, at \$2,000 each; recorder, \$2,000; 11 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; 2 law examiners, at \$2,000 each; 10 principal examiners of land claims and contests, at \$2,000 each; 30 clerks of class 4; 56 clerks of class 3; 59 clerks of class 2; 61 clerks of class 1; 53 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 59 copyists; 2 messengers; 8 assistant messengers; 21 laborers; and 1 packer, \$720; 1 depository acting for the Commissioner as receiver of public moneys and also as confidential secretary, \$2,000; librarian for the law library of the General Land Office, to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior wholly with reference to his special fitness for such work, \$1,000; in all, \$499,670.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 25, to increase the appropriation for law books for the law library of the General Land Office from \$200 to \$450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, line 1, before the word "clerks" to strike out "five" and insert "seven;" in the same line, before the word "clerks," to strike out "fourteen" and insert "twelve;" in line 8, after the word "each," to insert "clerk, \$900;" in line 11, after the word "messengers," to strike out "2 laborers" and insert "laborer," and in line 15, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-two thousand three hundred and eighty" and insert "thirty-three thousand and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

Indian Office: For the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, \$4,000; Assistant Commissioner, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, \$3,000; financial clerk, \$2,000; chief of division, \$2,000; principal bookkeeper, \$1,800; 7 clerks of class 4; 12 clerks of class 3; draftsman, \$1,600; stenographer, \$1,600; stenographer, \$1,400; 10 clerks of class 2; 25 clerks of class 1; 14 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 stenographer, and 1 clerk, to superintendent of Indian schools, at \$1,000 each; clerk, \$900; 17 copyists; architect, \$1,500; draftsman, \$1,500; 1 messenger; 2 assistant messengers; laborer; female messenger, \$840; messenger boy, \$360; and two charwomen; in all, \$133,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 103, line 7, to increase the salary of the chief clerk of the Patent Office from \$2,250 to \$2,500; in line 8, to increase the salary of two law clerks from \$2,000 each to \$2,500 each; on page 104, line 8, to increase the number of copyists from 88 to 96; in line 9, to reduce the number of copyists at \$720 each from 51 to 41; in line 13, to increase the number of messenger boys at \$360 each from 29 to 34; and in line 16, to increase the total appropriation from \$770,350 to \$773,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 104, after line 20, to insert: For purchase of law books, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 5, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "specialist in Spanish-American educational systems, \$1,400;" in line 15, before the word "hundred," to strike out "fifty thousand two" and insert "fifty-one thousand eight;" so as to make the clause read:

Bureau of Education: For Commissioner of Education, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$1,800; statistician, \$1,800; translator, \$1,600; collector and compiler of statistics, \$2,400; specialist in foreign educational systems, \$1,800; specialist in education as a preventive of pauperism and crime, \$2,000; specialist in Spanish-American educational systems, \$1,400; 2 clerks of class 4; 2 clerks of class 3; 4 clerks of class 2; 7 clerks of class 1; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 7 copyists; 2 copyists, at \$800 each; copyist, \$720; skilled laborer, \$840; 1 assistant messenger; 2 laborers; 2 laborers, at \$480 each; laborer, \$400; and 1 laborer, \$360; in all, \$51,820.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 22, after the word "dollars," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the office of Commissioner of Railroads shall terminate on the 30th day of June, 1901.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, after line 24, to strike out:

For examination of books and accounts of certain subsidized railroad companies, and inspecting roads, shops, machinery, and equipments thereof, \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 108, line 4, after the word "dollars," to insert:

Chief clerk and assistant, \$2,250, and said officer hereafter in case of the absence or disability of the Architect shall have full power and authority to do and perform all the acts which the Architect might himself do, and in case of a vacancy shall perform the duties of the Architect until the vacancy shall be filled according to law.

In line 11, before the word "draftsman," to strike out "1 clerk of class 4;" and in line 22, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fourteen thousand seven hundred and sixty-four" and insert "fifteen thousand two hundred and fourteen;" so as to make the clause read:

Office of the Architect of the Capitol: For Architect, \$4,500; chief clerk and assistant, \$2,250, and said officer hereafter in case of the absence or disability

of the Architect shall have full power and authority to do and perform all the acts which the Architect might himself do, and in case of a vacancy shall perform the duties of the Architect until the vacancy shall be filled according to law; draftsman, \$1,800; compensation to disbursing clerk, \$1,000; one assistant messenger; person in charge of the heating of the Supreme Court and central portion of the Capitol, \$864; laborer in charge of water-closets in central portion of the Capitol, \$660; three laborers for cleaning Rotunda, corridors, and Dome, at \$660 each; two laborers in charge of public closets of the House of Representatives and in the terrace, at \$720 each; in all, \$15,214.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 109, line 23, to increase the appropriation for stationery for the Department of the Interior from \$52,500 to \$59,900.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, line 14, to increase the appropriation for postage stamps for the Department of the Interior and its bureaus, as required under the Postal Union, to prepay postage on matter addressed to Postal Union countries, from \$3,000 to \$3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, line 16, to increase the salary of the surveyor-general of Alaska from \$2,000 to \$3,000; and in line 18 to increase the total appropriation for the office of the surveyor-general of Alaska from \$5,000 to \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 116, line 2, before the word "dollars," to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "one hundred;" in line 14, before the word "chief," to strike out "1 clerk of class 4;" in line 15, after the word "division," to insert "\$2,000;" in line 16, before the word "clerks," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-one;" and in line 24, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixty-six thousand two hundred and eighty" and insert "sixty-seven thousand seven hundred and thirty;" so as to make the clause read:

Office First Assistant Postmaster-General: For First Assistant Postmaster-General, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,100; Superintendent of the Money-Order System, \$3,000; chief clerk Money-Order System, \$2,000; superintendent of free delivery, \$3,000; 4 assistant superintendents of free delivery, at \$2,000 each; Superintendent of the Dead-Letter Office, \$2,500; 1 clerk of class 4, who shall be chief clerk of the Dead-Letter Office; superintendent of salaries and allowances, \$3,000; assistant superintendent of salaries and allowances, \$2,000; superintendent of post-office supplies, \$2,250; assistant superintendent of the division of post-office supplies, \$1,800; chief of the correspondence division, \$2,000; 10 clerks of class 4; 18 clerks of class 3; 21 clerks of class 2; 42 clerks of class 1; 45 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 37 clerks, at \$800 each; 8 assistant messengers; 25 laborers; 2 pages, at \$360 each; and 5 female laborers, at \$480 each; in all, \$267,730.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 117, line 10, before the word "dollars," to insert "one hundred;" in line 11, after the word "dollars," to insert "chief of contract division, \$2,000; chief of mail equipment division, \$2,000;" in line 16, before the word "clerks," to strike out "eleven" and insert "nine;" in line 19, before the word "clerks," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "sixteen;" and in line 23, before the word "hundred," to strike out "sixty-eight thousand nine" and insert "seventy thousand four;" so as to make the clause read:

Office Second Assistant Postmaster-General: For Second Assistant Postmaster-General, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,100; chief of division of inspection, \$2,000; chief of contract division, \$2,000; chief of mail equipment division, \$2,000; superintendent of railway adjustment division, \$2,000; superintendent of foreign mails, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; 9 clerks of class 4; 36 clerks of class 3; 19 clerks of class 2; stenographer, \$1,600; 19 clerks of class 1; 16 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 6 clerks, at \$800 each; messenger in charge of mails, \$900; 4 assistant messengers; and 2 laborers; in all, \$170,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, line 1, before the word "dollars," to insert "one hundred;" in line 5, before the word "dollars," to insert "two hundred and fifty;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "chief of classification division, \$2,000;" in line 8, before the word "assistant," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" and in line 15, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-nine thousand five hundred and ninety" and insert "forty-three thousand nine hundred and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

Office Third Assistant Postmaster-General: For Third Assistant Postmaster-General, \$4,000; chief clerk, \$2,100; chief of division of postage stamps, \$2,250; chief of finance division, who shall give bond in such amount as the Postmaster-General may determine for the faithful discharge of his duties, \$2,250; chief of classification division, \$2,000; superintendent of registry system, \$2,500; 4 assistant superintendents of registry system, at \$2,000 each; 4 clerks of class 4; 18 clerks of class 3; 22 clerks of class 2; 26 clerks of class 1; 10 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 6 clerks, at \$800 each; 3 assistant messengers; 8 laborers; in all, \$143,940.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, line 21, to increase the appropriation for per diem allowance for assistant superintendents of registry system, when actually traveling on business of the Post-Office Department, etc., from \$4,380 to \$5,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, page 118, line 24, to increase the salary of the chief clerk from \$2,000 to \$2,100, and on page 119, line 10, to increase the total appropriation for the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General from \$109,460 to \$109,560.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 121, line 20, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eleven thousand," and insert "fourteen thousand nine hundred and eighty-five," and in line 20, after the word "sum," to insert "not exceeding \$3,985 may be expended for telephone service, and;" so as to make the clause read:

For miscellaneous items, including \$1,500 for the office of the Auditor for the Post-Office Department, \$14,985, of which sum not exceeding \$3,985 may be expended for telephone service, and not exceeding \$500 may be expended for law books, books of reference, railway guides, city directories, and books necessary to conduct the business of the Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 122, line 6, to increase the appropriation for the publication of copies of the Official Postal Guide, including not exceeding 1,500 copies for the use of the Executive Departments, from \$20,000 to \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 122, line 25, before the word "dollars," to insert "five hundred;" page 123, line 12, after the word "each," to insert "law clerk, \$2,500;" and on page 124, line 2, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "seventy-eight;" so as to make the clause read:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Office of the Attorney-General: For compensation of the Attorney-General, \$8,000; Solicitor-General, \$7,000; 4 Assistant Attorneys-General, at \$5,000 each; Assistant Attorney-General at the Post-Office Department, \$4,500; solicitor of internal revenue, \$4,500; solicitor for the Department of State, \$4,500; 2 assistant attorneys, at \$3,000 each; 4 assistant attorneys, at \$2,500 each; assistant attorney, \$2,000; assistant attorney, in charge of dockets, \$2,500; law clerk and examiner of titles, \$2,700; chief clerk and ex officio superintendent of the building, \$2,500; private secretary to the Attorney-General, \$2,250; stenographer to the Solicitor-General, \$1,600; 3 stenographic clerks, at \$1,600 each; law clerk, \$2,500; 2 law clerks, at \$2,000 each; 7 clerks of class 4; chief of division of accounts, \$3,500; attorney in charge of pardons, \$2,400; additional for disbursing clerk, \$500; 7 clerks of class 3; 9 clerks of class 2; 16 clerks of class 1; telegraph operator and stenographer, \$1,200; 9 copyists; 1 messenger; 8 assistant messengers; 4 laborers; 3 watchmen; engineer, \$1,200; 2 conductors of the elevator, at \$720 each; 8 charwomen; superintendent of building, \$250; and 3 firemen; in all, \$178,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Labor," on page 126, line 3, to increase the total appropriation for per diem in lieu of subsistence of special agents and employees while traveling on duty away from home and outside of the District of Columbia, at a rate not to exceed \$3 per day, etc., from \$58,000 to \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 6, to increase the appropriation for books, periodicals, and newspapers for the library of the Department of Labor from \$500 to \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, after line 21, to insert:

Court of Private Land Claims: For chief justice and four associate justices, at \$5,000 each;
For clerk, \$2,000;
For stenographer, \$1,500;
For attorney, \$3,500;
For interpreter and translator, \$1,500; in all, \$33,500.
For deputy clerks, as authorized by law, so much therefor as may be necessary.

That section 19 of an act entitled "An act to establish a Court of Private Land Claims and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1891, as amended in legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1898, approved February 19, 1897, be, and the same is hereby, further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 19. That the powers and functions of the court established by this act shall cease and determine on the 30th day of June, 1902, and all papers, files, and records in the possession of the said court belonging to any other public office of the United States shall be returned to such office, and all other papers, files, and records in the possession of or appertaining to said court shall be returned to and filed in the Department of the Interior."

To enable the Attorney-General to employ such assistant attorneys, agents, stenographers, and experts to aid the United States attorney for said court as may be necessary to conduct the business of the Court of Private Land Claims during the fiscal year 1901, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 130, line 7, to increase the salary of commissioner in Yellowstone National Park from \$1,000 to \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 130, line 19, after the word "dollars," to insert "1 clerk, at \$1,600, 1 clerk, at \$1,400;" in line 21, before the word "clerks," to strike out "five" and insert "three;" in line 25, after the word "dollars," to strike out "2 laborers" and insert "1 assistant messenger; 1 laborer;" and on page 131, line 3, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty-three thousand eight hundred and eighty" and insert "forty-four thousand five hundred and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

Court of Claims: For salaries of five judges of the Court of Claims, at \$4,500 each; chief clerk, \$3,000; assistant clerk, \$2,000; bailiff, \$1,500; 1 clerk, at \$1,600; 1 clerk, at \$1,400; 3 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 1 messenger; 1 stenographer, \$1,200; 3 firemen; 3 watchmen; 1 elevator conductor, \$720; 1 assistant messenger; 1 laborer; and 2 charwomen; in all, \$44,540.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 131, after line 3, to insert:
To defray the cost of the employment of auditors in the Court of Claims, to be disbursed under the direction of the court, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, line 18, after the word "service," to strike out:

For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this section the head of each of the Executive Departments of the Government is hereby directed to certify, from time to time, to the Civil Service Commission the names of all persons employed in his Department, or any of the branches of the public service subordinate thereto, permanently incapacitated from any cause from performing the public service in which he is engaged, and upon receipt of said certification the Civil Service Commission shall strike the names of said persons from the classified service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. CULLOM. The Committee on Appropriations have some additional amendments, which I desire to move, that have not been included in the bill as printed. On page 36, line 21, I move to strike out the word "three" and insert "four;" so as to read "4 clerks of class 4."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that when the different amendments which are offered are adopted the clerks be authorized to change the totals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that will be done in all cases.

Mr. CULLOM. On page 75, line 18, in the provision in respect of Oklahoma Territory, after the word "location," I move to insert:

Provided, further, That said legislative assembly shall not make any appropriation or enter into any contract for a permanent capitol building.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. On page 78, after the word "dollars," in line 3, I move to insert "2 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each."

Mr. COCKRELL. Where does that come in?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On page 78.

Mr. CULLOM. After the word "dollars," in line 3, page 78. It has reference to the Adjutant-General's Office.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire in the same line to strike out "twelve" and insert "ten;" so as to read "10 clerks of class 4." That will reduce the number of clerks. The total may be changed by the clerks.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. On page 87, line 14, after the word "copyists," I move to insert "20 copyists, at \$840 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. On page 87, line 15, I move to strike out "1 assistant messenger" and insert in lieu thereof the words "3 messengers."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. In line 16, page 87, I move to strike out "two" and insert "three," and to change the total in lines 16 and 17.

Mr. PETTIGREW. What page is that?

Mr. CULLOM. Page 87.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is proposed to strike out "2 laborers" and insert "3 laborers?"

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; that is all.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not see the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who is a member of the committee, present, and in his absence I will move the amendment myself. On page 88, line 1, after the word "three," I move to insert:

One electrical expert and draftsman, \$1,600.

Mr. COCKRELL. Where is that to come in?

Mr. CULLOM. Page 88.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Page 88, line 1, after the word "three."

Mr. CULLOM. I move to insert "1 electrical expert and draftsman, \$1,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. On page 88, lines 4 and 5, the total should be changed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The total will be changed.

Mr. CULLOM. On page 93, line 21, after the word "dollars" where it first occurs, I move to insert "2 copyists, at \$840 each."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. In line 23, on the same page, the total should be changed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The total will be corrected.

Mr. CULLOM. On page 96, line 9, I move to strike out "fourteen" and insert "twenty;" and after the word "watchmen" to insert "1 conductor of elevator, at \$760;" so as to read "20 watchmen; 1 conductor of elevator, at \$760."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator please restate the amendment?

Mr. CULLOM. Page 96, line 9, strike out "fourteen" and insert "twenty;" so as to read "20 watchmen."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first "fourteen" or the last "fourteen?"

Mr. CULLOM. The first "fourteen."

Mr. COCKRELL. Before the word "watchmen?"

Mr. CULLOM. Yes; the first "fourteen." Then after "watchmen" I move to insert "1 conductor of elevator, at \$760."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMillan].

Mr. McMILLAN. On page 6, line 20, I move to strike out "forty-one" and insert "forty-nine;" so as to read: "49 laborers."

Mr. CULLOM. I agree to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. The total will have to be changed.

Mr. CULLOM. The clerks are correcting the totals.

Mr. COCKRELL. In line 21, after the word "each" and before the semicolon, I move to insert "which shall be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no further amendments to offer.

Mr. MORGAN. I offer an amendment to come in on page 7, line 12. I move to strike out "six" where it occurs in that line and to insert "eight." I want to take a moment to state my reason for offering the amendment.

The purpose of the amendment is to increase the salary of the first assistant in the document room from \$1,600 to \$1,800. George H. Boyd is the man who is employed as first assistant, and he has been there for many years. He is very useful to the Senate. His labors are very important. Mr. Boyd does more work for the Senate than almost any man connected with the body as an employee except Mr. Amzi Smith. He does it in splendid style, and has been doing it since he was almost a child, and his compensation is not adequate.

Mr. CULLOM. I make no point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. All right. I merely wanted to say that much about it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the amendments be concurred in in gross?

The amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment in the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS. On page 46, line 12, I move to strike out the word "two" and insert the word "four;" so as to read "\$1,400."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 46, line 12, strike out the word "two" and insert "four;" so as to read "\$1,400."

Mr. CULLOM. We gave that clerk \$1,200.

Mr. DAVIS. But it is not as much as was estimated for and recommended by the Department, which was \$1,400. I introduced an amendment announcing my intention to make this proposition. I have sent for the printed amendment; it is not here, but that is the substance of it. I wish the Senator would accept it. It applies to just one man.

Mr. CULLOM. We have increased his salary \$200.

Mr. DAVIS. But it was not increased to the amount which was estimated for by the Department.

Mr. CULLOM. Of course, and there are a thousand cases in the bill where more was estimated for than they get.

Mr. DAVIS. This is just one case. I have a special communication from Mr. Ellis H. Roberts, the Treasurer of the United States, which I ask may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1900.

DEAR SIR: Will you kindly hear Mr. Frank M. Barnes for a few moments? He is the compositor and pressman in this office mentioned in my letter, Document 123, House of Representatives. Your amendment of February 24 covers his case exactly. The committee's change does him much less than justice. His services are worth more rather than less than those of the pressmen who are to be raised to \$1,400. I trust your amendment will prevail in its entirety.

Yours, very truly,

ELLIS H. ROBERTS,
Treasurer of the United States.

Hon. CUSHMAN K. DAVIS, United States Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not ask for that increase. We have increased this man's salary \$200, which is as much as we did for anybody who is a clerk in one of the Departments. Every other clerk will think he is wronged if we do this.

Mr. DAVIS. But I understand that the committee have increased another class of men in this particular division of the Department to \$1,400. They have increased Mr. Barnes to but \$1,200, and Mr. Roberts, the Treasurer, says that Mr. Barnes is entitled to the same compensation that those men are to receive.

Mr. CULLOM. We have not increased the pay of any clerk more than \$200. Some of the \$1,800 clerks have gone to \$2,000,

and become chiefs of divisions. Some of the \$1,600 clerks have gone to \$1,800; some have gone from \$1,400 to \$1,600, and some from \$1,200 to \$1,400. We have increased the pay of this man from \$1,000 to \$1,200, and I hope the Senator will not press the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. I feel like taking the sense of the Senate on the question.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not want to raise a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. Can a point of order be raised when I offered an amendment to this effect which was referred to the committee?

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know that it can. I presume that it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. DAVIS. I should like to have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I only desire to add a word to what was said by the Senator from Illinois. There are three of these people in the Treasurer's office. Two of them are receiving \$1,200 now, and this gentleman is receiving \$1,000. We increased them all \$200 each. Whatever the United States Treasurer may say, these people have never had the same compensation, and we have increased them exactly in the same proportion. Now, if we increase this salary to \$1,400 the others will come back next year and say they ought to receive \$1,600. We have preserved precisely the same ratio as that which has uniformly prevailed in the Department as respects these people.

Mr. DAVIS. The point in my mind is that Mr. Roberts, the Treasurer, says this man's services are worth \$1,400, and he ought to receive that compensation.

Mr. CULLOM. We let them go up by degrees. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PETTIGREW. In line 10, page 5, after the words "inter-oceanic canals," I move to insert "transportation and sale of meat products."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 746) to authorize C. R. Dobbins to accept a gold watch awarded to him by the government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of his humane and gallant services to the shipwrecked crew of the British schooner *Ashton*, at Weymouth, Nova Scotia;

A bill (S. 1740) to authorize C. E. Marr and E. H. Pierce to accept silver watches awarded to them by the government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of their services in rescuing British sailors;

A bill (S. 114) to constitute South Manchester, Conn., a port of entry; and

A bill (S. 3138) to provide for necessary repairs to the steamer *Thetis* for service as a revenue cutter.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BARNEY, Mr. McCLEARY, and Mr. BELL managers at the conference on the part of the House.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (H. R. 445) for the relief of Clare M. Ashby, widow of W. W. Ashby, late United States consul at Colon;

A bill (H. R. 1454) for the relief of William L. Orr;

A bill (H. R. 4686) for the relief of J. A. Ware; and

A bill (H. R. 5969) for the relief of the devisees and legal representatives of D. L. Huskey, deceased.

The bill (H. R. 2757) to authorize the purchase of certain lands in the district of Alaska was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The bill (H. R. 2322) for the relief of Joshua Bishop was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL. That bill, I think, went to the Committee on Naval Affairs before.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill relates to a lieutenant-commander in the United States Navy. The Chair is inclined to think it ought to go to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL. In the last Congress it was reported favorably

by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. McENERY]. I think he was then a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, as he is now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

FORT HAYS MILITARY RESERVATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 68) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal School thereon, and for a public park.

The amendments were, in line 7, page 1, to strike out "a western branch" and insert "an experiment station;" in line 1, page 2, to strike out "western branches" and insert "an experiment station;" in line 2, page 2, after "and" insert "a western branch of;" in line 5, page 2, after "States" to insert "Provided further, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any tract or tracts within the limits of said reservation to which a valid claim has attached, by settlement or otherwise, under any of the public-land laws of the United States."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation, in said State, for the purpose of establishing an experiment station of the Kansas Agricultural College, and a western branch of the Kansas State Normal School thereon, and for a public park."

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments made to the bill by the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 16th instant approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 75) to print 31,000 copies of the eulogies on Garret A. Hobart, late Vice-President of the United States.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, and asking a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BAKER. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and agree to the request of the House of Representatives for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. SHOUP, Mr. QUARLES, and Mr. TALIAFERRO were appointed.

SPANISH CLAIMS COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, unless the Senator from Ohio wishes to proceed with that bill this afternoon, I should like to have the pending order temporarily laid aside without losing its precedence, so that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2799) to carry into effect the stipulations of Article VII of the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Mr. FORAKER. That is a matter which will take only a short time.

Mr. DAVIS. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. FORAKER. It is a bill—

Mr. DAVIS. It is a bill reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations to create a commission to adjudicate upon the claims which we have assumed under the treaty of Paris.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. FORAKER. I understood that there were one or two Senators who wished to speak to-day upon the Puerto Rican bill. I interrupted the Senator only to inquire whether the bill he desires to call up is likely to take much time.

Mr. DAVIS. I should think not. Still, I do not know. Of course if any Senator has given notice of his intention to speak, I shall withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. FORAKER. Very well; under the circumstances I will yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill which will be read in full to the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 2799) to carry into effect the

stipulations of Article VII of the treaty between the United States and Spain concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. DAVIS. I offer an amendment to come in on line 17, page 3, section 5; which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the words "United States," in line 17, on page 3, section 5, it is proposed to insert "including the sum of \$3 per day, which the courts of the United States are now authorized by section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896, to allow to commissioners."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. I offer an additional amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, section 13, line 23, it is proposed to strike out:

That the claimant or the United States shall have the same rights of appeal from any final award of the commission exceeding the sum of \$5,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That either the claimant or the United States may appeal from any final decision of the commission allowing or rejecting any claim where the amount in controversy is more than \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, in section 11, line 15, before the word "damage," it is proposed to strike out "immediate" and insert "direct;" so as to read:

That the award in favor of any claimant shall be only for the amount of the actual and direct damage which said claimant shall prove that he has sustained.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. There has been considerable criticism, and several suggestions have been made in regard to this bill, that the allowance of two appeals, one to the court of appeals and thence to the Supreme Court of the United States, was unnecessary and too onerous. I shall not present amendments myself to meet those objections, although several of them have been suggested to me; but I deem it fair to advise the Senate that a great deal of criticism has been made upon the bill in that respect. My own personal opinion is that one appeal to a court of appeals would be sufficient; but I do not myself feel warranted, under the instructions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to make a motion for that change in the bill.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota to state to the Senate in some general way what sort of claims are likely to come up under this bill? What are the classes of claims referred to in the treaty of Paris under the seventh article? I will read the whole of the seventh article, as it is only a few lines in length:

ARTICLE VII.

The United States and Spain mutually relinquish all claims for indemnity, national and individual, of every kind, of either Government, or of its citizens or subjects, against the other Government, that may have arisen since the beginning of the late insurrection in Cuba and prior to the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty, including all claims for indemnity for the cost of the war.

Of course we are dealing here only with the claims of citizens of the United States against the Government of Spain. The article goes on to provide:

The United States will adjudicate and settle the claims of its citizens against Spain relinquished in this article.

Now, what is the nature of those claims, so far as they have been brought to the attention of the Senator or to the attention of his committee?

Mr. DAVIS. Well, Mr. President, the nature of those claims is various. As disclosed by the record of them in the Department of State—and the record has been accumulating since 1895, when the insurrection broke out—they embrace claims against Spain for the destruction of property represented by United States investments in Cuba, which Spain, under the treaty of 1795 and by the general principles of international law, was obliged to use due diligence to protect.

Mr. HOAR. Are there any claims for the destruction of vessels or the detention of vessels, the breaking up of voyages?

Mr. DAVIS. None that I am aware of, although there may be. Then, there are claims for personal wrongs, cruelties to American citizens. There is notably the claim of Mrs. Ruiz, the wife of Dr. Ruiz, who, it is claimed, was tortured and massacred by the Spanish authorities while in prison. It is exceedingly difficult to specify the character of these claims distributively; but it is enough to say—it must be enough to say, and it is as much as any man can say—that they embrace the entire scope of any claims the United States may have made against Spain if article 7 had not been

entered into for injuries to the property or to the persons of American citizens. The bill has been very carefully drawn in view of the indeterminate nature of these claims. Of course, the commission will have to consider any claim that any one chooses to bring before it by way of petition.

As I said a moment ago, the committee has attempted to draw this bill very carefully, so as to protect the Government in that respect by appeal and by procedure.

Mr. HOAR. I put my question with three ideas in view. One was as to the rather harsh provision for barring claims forever. These claims are all to be forever barred unless presented within six months' time of the first meeting of the commission, and there is no provision for any advertisement of the first meeting of the commission, and there is no time fixed for it by the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. It must be within thirty days.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator says it must be within thirty days, and that partly answers the question; still it seems to me the provision is harsh in the case of persons who are citizens—and a number, it may be, are citizens of the United States on the Pacific coast, or wherever else on the face of the earth the United States may extend, as to which nobody knows as yet—a person may be insane or under guardianship, or they may be ignorant or poor persons. It seems to me that a perpetual bar, especially when the commission itself may be continued from time to time for years and do its work of hearing these claims, is rather harsh.

Then, another suggestion which occurred to me—

Mr. DAVIS. Let me first answer that.

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator has kindly consented that I may answer that observation, which was—

Mr. HOAR. If I may add one sentence before the Senator answers, I wish to say that I have been here, and I suppose the Senator has in part, when we have had the old Alabama claims under consideration; and we have had several other classes of claims where special tribunals have been established for their adjudication. Congress has been beset, behind and before, after the conclusion of the time fixed by those statutes, much more liberal than this, with applications for special legislation to enable persons to bring in their claims after the claims were barred by the statute. That was not the only case with the Alabama claims, but we have had several other classes of claims of the same kind.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, in view of the indeterminate amount of these claims and of the history of preceding commissions, the committee were of opinion that it was best within limits to fix a time in which the commission should perform its work and also a time within that time when claims to be adjudicated should be presented to it. The time fixed for the commission to complete its work is two years, subject to extension by the President in case of necessity.

In regard to the time of filing claims, it was deemed very material and very desirable that within six months from the organization or meeting of the commission everybody should have his claim in, so that adjudication could proceed upon the entire amount of claims; otherwise the thing would drift along under the time given to file claims up to very nearly the expiration of the life of the commission, as intended by the bill, and then at a late day claims would be filed, thereby making necessary the successive and indeterminate continuation of the commission.

The fact is, as I am informed, and I think reliably informed, that substantially all the claims that will be brought for adjudication before this commission are already on file in the State Department. They amount to some eighteen or twenty million dollars as the aggregate of damages claimed. Of course we all know that the bringing in of claims in cases of this kind by no means indicates the true liability of the United States. So we thought, everything being considered, it was best to fix a limit to the commission; and in order to secure that time limitation for its action, we fixed a limitation of the time within which claims should be submitted to it, namely, six months from the date of the organization of the commission.

If there should arise any special case of hardship, insanity, infancy, or anything of that kind, which has prevented, through inadvertence, the claimant getting in within six months, I have no question that as a special matter Congress would treat it very liberally; but I think the advantages are very considerable—in fact, almost decisive—of fixing a time when these claims shall, in the manner provided by this bill, be laid before the commission, so that the adjudication shall proceed; otherwise, when the two years elapse, you will find within a few months or weeks of the time we shall have to extend the life of the commission again.

Mr. HOAR. I would suggest to the Senator whether it would not be more reasonable, and whether, on the whole, it would not come within the principle on which he is acting, if it should be said that the claims shall be forever barred, provided that—the commission will sit for two years at any rate—within six months thereafter good cause shall be shown to the commission why any claimant has not at an earlier period presented his claim, the com-

mission should have a discretion to receive it within a further period of six months?

Mr. DAVIS. I am not at all strenuous about that. I will accept such an amendment.

Mr. HOAR. That would relieve the hardship. I never heard before, in any legislative proceeding whatever, of so short a period of limitation as this, and I will venture to suggest we shall have countless applications to Congress for special relief, unless we insert some provision of this kind.

Mr. DAVIS. I shall not object to an amendment of that character.

Mr. PETTUS. I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. Has it not oftentimes been decided that as between individuals these very short statutes of limitations were unlawfully passed even when they were enacted by competent authority?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly, I so understand; and especially when we consider that, reversing the case, the United States, as a matter of general policy, does not allow any limitation to its claim against the citizen. I will venture to prepare an amendment to that part of the bill. I move at the close of section 9 to insert:

Provided, That the commission may receive claims presented within six months after the termination of said period if the claimants shall establish to their satisfaction good reasons for not presenting the same earlier.

Mr. DAVIS. That amendment is accepted, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have that amendment read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Reporter will read the amendment.

The Reporter read the amendment submitted by Mr. HOAR.

Mr. DAVIS. That is simply that the six months' limitation stands in general; and in exceptional cases, upon good cause shown, as I understand it, another six months is given.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I want to ask the Senator from Minnesota in regard to section 11, as to the cases of claims for the destruction of property, plantations, sugar establishments, etc. Is it reasonable to make a universal rule that no interest shall be allowed?

Mr. DAVIS. I think, Mr. President, that such a universal rule is reasonable in actions of tort; and this is analogous to such an action. In an action of tort at common law interest is never allowed. The fact is we are perplexed, and have been here session after session, importuned in every conceivable way by claimants for interest upon claims against the Government. As to whatever damage has been suffered, whatever reasonable and immediate damage a claimant can prove himself to have sustained, the court can take into consideration all of the elements of compensation which will go to make him whole. After doing that and giving the court the wide range of discretion always confided to courts and juries in cases of torts or quasi torts, then to allow a computation of interest from a certain date upon a claim of that kind seemed to the committee entirely unreasonable. Hence we were careful, and shall be strenuous in insisting that it shall stand as a feature of this bill, that interest shall not be allowed upon a claim or an award at the very basis of which lies such a widespread discretion as to what shall be or what shall not be permitted as cumulative to the exercise of that discretion.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator from Minnesota allow me to add a word to what he has so justly said?

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The question of interest is not of such great importance with this bill, but everybody who is familiar with Congressional legislation knows that long after every Senator here is dead and forgotten claims will come before this body and acts of Congress be asked for the payment of some claim arising under this bill, and good cause shown why the claim was not filed before this commission. If we once open the door in the original bill for the payment of interest, we shall pay enormously in the years that are to come.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS] suggested the impropriety of a statute of limitations. There is none against the Government in fact, but we limit this to two years, when everybody knows that year after year and year after year there will be claims of enormous amounts sought to be pressed through Congress for damages that were suffered from the commencement of the Spanish insurrection until date.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] is mistaken. I made no objection to a statute of limitations. I made objection to an extremely short limitation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I beg the Senator's pardon. I misunderstood him.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I intended when I raised this question to submit it, as I did, as a question for the consideration of the committee; but I am bound to say that I do not think that the suggestion that somebody hereafter may make a reasonable or an unreasonable claim against the Government is a very good

cause why we should not settle as nearly just a rule as we can settle. In the first place, I do not think these claims will come in; certainly not after the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] is forgotten, for he never will be forgotten while human history lasts.

These people are entitled to interest against Spain. In all public international torts interest is allowed in all claims presented.

Mr. DAVIS. Was interest awarded against England in the Alabama claims?

Mr. HOAR. Yes; it was undoubtedly taken into account, and there was something left afterwards. More than the amount involved in the actual cases presented was allowed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. HOAR. I will yield if the Senator merely wants to ask a question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is only a question.

Mr. HOAR. Is it in relation to the matter that I was going to ask the Senator?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not at all; but I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that this is an act of grace. It is not a matter of legal right, and the question of interest here is upon a different footing from that in a legal claim. Does not the Senator think so?

Mr. HOAR. No; I do not think so. I do not think it is an act of grace; but it is a matter of right. If an American citizen has a good claim against Spain, he is entitled as a matter of right—it is the citizen's right—to have that claim enforced, if necessary, until the Army has used up its last man and the Navy has fired its last gun.

We are for our convenience to get a cession of territory, or whatever motive entered into this transaction. A man who had a claim for an injury done him by Spain twelve months before, who had had his plantation burned, for instance, would, by all fair and just considerations, be entitled to have the interest paid until he got his money. Now the United States comes in and says we will get more territory, or some other equivalent, and we will arrange with Spain that that claim we will give up and pay the citizen ourselves; we will pay half of it, or a part of it, and no more. I do not think that is just; but I do not propose to make a division of the Senate on that question, because I know that there are so many complications and so many various views about allowing interest in such cases that it would probably delay the passage of a very just and humane and proper bill, but I do not give up my opinion about it.

Mr. President, I want to make one other suggestion to the Senator, which I think he will accept, in all probability, after what he has said. I suggest whether it would not be well to confine the appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States upon questions of law as made up on the record? The Senator suggested his own individual view that two appeals were unnecessary. There may be some very important questions of public law involved in this matter, in which we might like to have the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, and not that of a local court of appeals.

I would say on page 8, lines 1 and 2:

The court shall hear and determine such appeals only upon the issues of law presented by the record upon the merits.

That might possibly require the direction that the court should record its decision on the questions of law. Whether that be necessary or not, I am not sure, but it seems to me that it would be a fair solution of this difficulty.

Mr. COCKRELL. I intend to move to strike out all of the provisions authorizing an appeal to the Supreme Court. I do not think it ought to be allowed, and I do not think there is any necessity for it.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the Senator suspend that motion for a moment until I can answer the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], that the appellate court, whether the Supreme Court or the court of appeals, or both, shall consider only questions of law is entirely against the theory of the bill in that respect, which was that those courts should each examine the questions both of law and of fact, as in an admiralty case or as in an equity case. The history of commissions in this country has taught us too well—

Mr. HOAR. I speak only of the second appeal after the appeal—

Mr. DAVIS. To the Supreme Court?

Mr. HOAR. To the Supreme Court, which is substantially given this whole jurisdiction. It considers nothing but questions of law.

Mr. DAVIS. Then, if the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] should prevail, that suggestion would fall. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. COCKRELL. On page 7, section 13, line 9, I move to strike out:

From the final judgment or decree of the said court of appeals either party may appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. DAVIS. I have no objection to that. So far as the committee is concerned, the amendment is accepted.

Mr. HOAR. That removes the whole trouble.

Mr. DAVIS. That removes the whole trouble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. In section 13, page 7, I move to strike out all after the word "appeals," in line 19, down to and including the word "States," in line 20; so as to read:

The appeal to the said court of appeals shall, as to each appeal, be taken within sixty days, etc.

Mr. DAVIS. I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. In section 13, page 7, I move to strike out all, commencing with line 23, down to and including the word "merits," in line 2, on page 8, as follows:

The return in case of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States shall consist of a certified copy of the entire record of said court of appeals, and the Supreme Court shall hear and determine such appeals upon the issues of fact and law presented by such records upon the merits.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. On page 7, section 13, after line 23, I propose to add:

The decisions and judgments of said court of appeals in all cases appealed to said court shall be final and conclusive.

Mr. DAVIS. That is accepted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. In section 14, page 8, line 16, I move to strike out the words "or by the Supreme Court of the United States;" so as to read:

And in every case of final award by said commission, or final judgment or decree, on appeal, by the said court of appeals, where the same is affirmed, etc.

Mr. DAVIS. That is accepted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. That makes it all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Massachusetts to offer an amendment?

Mr. HOAR. No; the amendments offered cover what I had in mind.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAILWAY ON WEST MOUNTAIN, HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

Mr. BERRY and Mr. WOLCOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 2956) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation. It is a very short bill and will take only a few moments.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I give notice to the Senate that after this bill is passed I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator will allow this bill to be passed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Very well.

Mr. FORAKER. I wish to have the Senate take up the unfinished business for an hour, at any rate, and I had agreed with a Senator who wanted an executive session that we would at 4 o'clock have an executive session. Will not that be soon enough?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I did not know of any such understanding or agreement. I do know that the discussion of the matter which calls for an executive session will take an hour or two, and I had understood that the first available moment was to be taken for it. If the Senator from Ohio, who is upon the Committee on Foreign Relations, is of opinion that the public business requires an open session until 4 o'clock, I shall not press the matter.

Mr. FORAKER. I wished very much to have the bill which is the unfinished business read again for amendments, not to be debated, in order that there might be a reprint of it for the convenience of the Senate. I thought that might be done by 4 o'clock.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the Senator's suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2956) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation, which will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. CLAY. I ask the Senator from Ohio to yield to me to call up a bill.

Mr. FORAKER. I do so.

Mr. CLAY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3149) for the erection of a public building at Atlanta, Ga.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire additional land adjoining the post-office and custom-house building at Atlanta, Ga., and to enlarge said building, at a total cost not to exceed \$500,000.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to be informed by some authority on this class of subjects—a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds—whether any public-building bills have passed both Houses, and if not, whether the committee expect that public-building bills will pass both Houses at the present session. I ask this question because I have one bill relating to my own State in which I have very great interest, and about which I wish to be vigilant, if that is the case.

Mr. WARREN. I may say that the information of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is that the House has not passed any one of these bills. The Senate has passed several. The House, I think, is considering the subject of grouping certain classes together.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MILITARY POST AT SHERIDAN, WYO.

Mr. WARREN. With the courtesy of the Senator from Ohio, I desire to call up the bill (S. 1475) to complete the establishment and erection of a military post near the city of Sheridan, in the State of Wyoming, and making appropriation therefor.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of War to complete the establishment and erection of a military post near the city of Sheridan, Wyo., at the site heretofore selected by the Major-General Commanding the Army and approved by the Secretary of War, and \$100,000 is proposed to be appropriated for continuing the work of constructing the necessary buildings, quarters, barracks, and stables for the post established under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BATE. I should like to be informed as to this bill.

Mr. WARREN. It is a bill which has been reported from the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. BATE. That is what I wanted to know.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM LAPOINT.

Mr. ROSS. I ask the Senator from Ohio to yield to me that I may call up a bill.

Mr. FORAKER. I yield.

Mr. ROSS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3148) to correct the military record of William Lapoint.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of War to correct the military record of William Lapoint, late private in Company C, Third Vermont Volunteers, by removing the charge of "desertion" and substituting "absented himself without proper authority," etc.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9080) appropriating, for the benefit and government of Puerto Rico, revenues collected on importations therefrom since its evacuation by Spain, and revenues hereafter collected on such importations under existing law; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CANNON, Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCRAE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 309) granting a pension to James M. Kercheval;

A bill (H. R. 524) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Davis;

A bill (H. R. 854) granting an increase of pension to John J. McCormick;

A bill (H. R. 2000) for the relief of Thomas Paul;

A bill (H. R. 2477) granting an increase of pension to George H. Pennington;

A bill (H. R. 2749) granting a pension to Susan Garrison;

A bill (H. R. 3067) granting an increase of pension to Melvina Bottles;

A bill (H. R. 3071) granting an increase of pension to John F. Nelson;

A bill (H. R. 3072) granting an increase of pension to William W. Wharton;

A bill (H. R. 4416) granting an increase of pension to Henry Geeson;

A bill (H. R. 5156) granting an increase of pension to Frances C. Kirby;

A bill (H. R. 5299) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McCune;

A bill (H. R. 5509) granting a pension to Malinda Jones; and

A bill (H. R. 6575) granting a pension to Matilda G. Higbee.

PUERTO RICAN REVENUES.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the Puerto Rican appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9080) appropriating, for the benefit and government of Puerto Rico, revenues collected on importations therefrom since its evacuation by Spain and revenues hereafter to be collected on such importations under existing law, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate accede to the request of the House of Representatives for a conference on the bill and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. ALLISON, Mr. HALE, and Mr. COCKRELL were appointed.

TIMBER ON PUBLIC MINERAL LANDS.

Mr. SIMON. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate for the present consideration of the bill 2866, permitting citizens of the United States, bona fide residents of the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, to fell and remove, for building, agricultural, mining, and other domestic purposes, timber growing or being upon the mineral lands of the United States in the States aforesaid.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 8 of the act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, as amended by an act approved March 3, 1891, chapter 559, page 1093, volume 26, United States Statutes at Large, be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows: After the word "Nevada," in said amended act, insert the words "California, Oregon, and Washington."

Mr. COCKRELL. I should be greatly obliged if the Senator from Oregon would read the act which it is proposed to amend. This is an amendment of it, and it simply proposes to add certain words. We have not the act before us. I will have it in a moment. I should like to hear the Senator read it.

Mr. SIMON. I will state for the information of the Senator from Missouri that in all the mining States of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, and in every other mineral State other than California, Oregon, and Washington, which through some inadvertence were admitted when the act was passed, the law authorizes bona fide residents and citizens to fell and remove for building, agricultural, mining, and other domestic purposes timber growing upon mineral lands, and it is sought by this bill simply to give the States of California, Oregon, and Washington the same rights that the other mineral States now have.

There is a general provision in the act referred to giving authority to all mining districts, but the Department have held that that is not broad enough to cover the three States named. This matter was considered very carefully by the Committee on Mines and Mining, of which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] is chairman, and there can not be any possible objection to it it seems to me.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish the Senator would turn to the statute.

Mr. SIMON. I have not the statute here.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish the Senator would show where the amendment will come in. It does not say where it is to come in. I want to see how the statute as amended will read.

Mr. SIMON. The only amendment there is to add the names of the three States. The Senator will find a number of States named in the act, and it is proposed to add after those States the States of California, Oregon, and Washington. If the Senator has the statute, he will see it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The

question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the provisions of section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1891, concerning prosecutions for cutting timber on public lands, to California, Oregon, and Washington."

JOSEPH BACIGALUPPI.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask the Senator from Ohio to yield to me that I may ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill.

Mr. FORAKER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 5139) for the relief of Joseph Bacigaluppi.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the name "Bacigaluppi" to insert "Margaretha Riehl, alias Margaret Riehl, Christiana Dengler, John A. Narges, and Smith Lee, all of the District of Columbia, and of Francesco Perna, of Montgomery County, State of Maryland;" and on page 2, line 2, after the word "remitted," to strike out—and that the title to such real estate be, and the same is hereby, vested in said Joseph Bacigaluppi as fully in every respect as though he had been a citizen of the United States at the time the same was purchased by and conveyed to him—

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That all real estate lying in the District of Columbia heretofore purchased by and conveyed to Joseph Bacigaluppi, Margaretha Riehl, alias Margaret Riehl, Christiana Dengler, John A. Narges, and Smith Lee, all of the District of Columbia, and of Francesco Perna, of Montgomery County, State of Maryland, be, and the same is hereby, relieved and exempted from the operations of an act entitled "An act to restrict the ownership of real estate in the Territories to American citizens, and so forth," approved March 3, 1887; and that all forfeitures incurred by force of said act in respect to such real estate be, and the same are hereby, remitted.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Joseph Bacigaluppi and others."

CONTINENTAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY AND OTHERS.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 227) for the relief of the Continental Fire Insurance Company and others.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to reopen and reexamine the refunding claims of the Continental Fire Insurance Company, the Eagle Fire Insurance Company, the City Fire Insurance Company, the Commercial Mutual Insurance Company of the State of New York, the Maryland Fire Insurance Company, the Western National Bank, the Merchants' National Bank, the Chesapeake Bank of the State of Maryland, and the Eastern Railroad Company of the State of Massachusetts, for taxes erroneously paid by them and now on file in his office, and to examine and allow such amounts as he may find the companies and banks have paid as a duplicate tax upon the same identical income or profits, or taxes in excess of the amount legally due, and to transmit his allowances to the proper accounting officers of the Treasury for certification to Congress, in compliance with the second section of the act of Congress approved July 7, 1884.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF T. C. FINNEY, DECEASED.

Mr. TURLEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2268) to carry into effect a finding of the Court of Claims in favor of Pamela B. Finney, administratrix of T. C. Finney, deceased.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It recites that the Court of Claims found that T. C. Finney, late of Shelby County, Tenn., was loyal to the United States throughout the civil war and that stores and supplies of the value of \$6,900 were taken from him by and for the use of the Federal Army and never paid for, and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay \$6,900 to Pamela B. Finney, administratrix of T. C. Finney, deceased.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BOISE CITY, IDAHO.

Mr. SHOUP. I ask the Senator from Ohio to yield for the consideration of a short bill. I do not think there will be any discussion whatever upon it.

Mr. FORAKER. If it will not lead to any discussion, I will yield.

Mr. SHOUP. I ask the Senate to consider the bill (S. 2388) to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Boise City, Idaho.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to increase to \$300,000 the amount heretofore fixed as a limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building for the use and accommodation of the United States post-office, court-house, surveyor-general's offices, district land offices, internal-revenue office, and other Government offices in the city of Boise City, Idaho.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

M. M. DEFREES.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. If the Senator from Ohio will permit me, I should like to call up a bill.

Mr. FORAKER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana and also to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], but I hope that I shall not be asked to yield further, because time is rapidly passing.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. The bill is a brief one and will not lead to any debate. I ask for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1772) for the payment of the claim of M. M. Defrees for the construction of a sewer adjacent to the lands of the United States known as the "Arsenal grounds," in the city of Indianapolis, Ind.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to appropriate \$4,494.56, in full for the payment of the claim of M. M. Defrees, of Indianapolis, Ind., for the construction of a sewer, known as "Pogues Run interception," on Hanna street, in the city of Indianapolis, adjacent to the lands of the United States known as the "Arsenal," that sum under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Indiana being a lien on said lands.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BURLINGTON, VT.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 3024) for the erection of a new public building at Burlington, Vt., be now taken up for consideration.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 6, after the word "post-office," to strike out "custom-house;" so as to make the section read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be erected a suitable building, with fireproof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the United States courts, post-office, and other Federal offices at Burlington, Vt.

The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and the expense of said building shall not exceed the sum of \$300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 1, after the word "custom-house," to strike out "Provided, however, That the Secretary of the Treasury may sell the land now owned by the United States and used as aforesaid and purchase a site for the building herein authorized if no additional expense to the Government is thereby incurred" and to insert "unless a site acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury be provided free of cost to the United States;" so as to make the section read:

That said building shall be erected on the site of the public building in said Burlington now used for a post-office and custom-house unless a site acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury be provided free of cost to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVENUE CUTTER FOR ST. MARYS RIVER, MICHIGAN.

Mr. McMILLAN. I ask unanimous consent to call up a bill, Mr. FORAKER. I understand that it will not take much time.

Mr. McMILLAN. No; it will not take much time. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 2683) to provide for the construction of a revenue cutter for use in St. Marys River, Michigan.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, in line 3, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty" and insert "seventy-five;" in line 6, after the word "construction," to insert "or purchase;" and in line 7, after the word "of" where it occurs the third time, to insert "a vessel to be used and equipped as;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the construction, or purchase, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, of a vessel to be used and equipped as a revenue cutter of the third class for service on the St. Marys River, Michigan, for the purpose of protecting the revenue and enforcing the rules of navigation on said river.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS A. YORKE.

Mr. HALE. I ask leave to call up the bill (S. 3441) for the relief of Louis A. Yorke. It is a bill which has passed the Senate three times.

Mr. FORAKER. I yield to the Senator from Maine if there is to be no debate; but I desire after that bill is considered to proceed with the unfinished business.

Mr. HALE. I am much obliged to the Senator. It will take only a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It authorizes the President of the United States to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint Louis A. Yorke a paymaster in the Navy as of the date he was wholly retired. But he shall not receive or be entitled to any pay, compensation, or allowance whatever prior to appointment under this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RIDA B. HASKELL.

Mr. FORAKER. Before calling up the unfinished business, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1804) granting an increase of pension to Rida B. Haskell.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Rida B. Haskell, widow of Joseph T. Haskell, late brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, and lieutenant-colonel Seventeenth United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GOVERNMENT OF PUERTO RICO.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8245) temporarily to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORAKER. The purpose of calling up the unfinished business at this time is to ask that certain proposed amendments may be agreed to, in order that the text of the bill may be corrected and that we may have a reprint of it when we come to consider the amendments which will be controverted. I do not expect at this time to ask consent to any amendments except only those which may be adopted without any dispute. If there is objection to any amendment that I propose, I will ask that it be passed over upon objection being made.

The first amendment that I desire to call attention to is one proposed to section 3, on page 4, line 16. I propose to amend by inserting after the word "citizens" the following:

Of Puerto Rico, and as such entitled to the protection.

So that as amended—

Mr. COCKRELL. In what line is the amendment?

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator kindly indicate the page and line?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes, sir. On page 4, line 16.

Mr. COCKRELL. What section?

Mr. FORAKER. Section 3. The proposed amendment is to insert, after the word "citizens"—

Mr. COCKRELL. What bill has the Senator?

Mr. FORAKER. I have bill 8245 with the Senate committee's substitute. This is the provision of the bill that fixes the civil and political status of the inhabitants of Puerto Rico. As the bill was reported from the committee it provided that certain inhabitants, who were described, should be deemed and held to be citizens of the United States. The amendment proposed is to insert, after the word "citizens," the words "of Puerto Rico, and as such entitled to the protection;" so that the clause would read:

Shall be deemed and held to be citizens of Puerto Rico, and as such entitled to the protection of the United States.

Mr. BACON. I understood the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio to be that he wishes to have only those amendments acted upon that will be consented to.

Mr. FORAKER. That is all. If there is objection, I will pass over this amendment.

Mr. BACON. I do not give my consent to the amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let me take that down. After the word "citizens" you propose to insert what words?

Mr. FORAKER. "Of Puerto Rico."

Mr. CLAY. And to strike out the words "of the United States?"

Mr. FORAKER. No, I do not strike out the words "United States." I propose to make the clause read: "Shall be deemed and held to be citizens of Puerto Rico, and as such entitled to the protection of the United States."

Mr. BACON. I understand the Senator does not wish to have an amendment acted on to-day if it is to be debated.

Mr. FORAKER. No, we will not debate the amendments now.

Mr. BACON. Then let this amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment being objected to, it will be passed over for the present.

Mr. FORAKER. That being the case, I now propose to strike out, at the end of line 25, on page 4, the word "in," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "as such." That is the provision of the bill which creates—

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us see how that clause would read if amended.

Mr. FORAKER. I am going to read it as it will stand if amended:

And they, together with such other citizens of the United States as may reside in Puerto Rico, shall constitute a body politic under the name of The People of Puerto Rico, with governmental powers as hereinafter conferred, and with power to sue and be sued as such.

That would be the end of the section as I propose to amend it.

Mr. COCKRELL. What do you do on page 5?

Mr. FORAKER. On page 5, I was about to say, I further amend by striking out lines 1, 2, and 3. I do not think there will be any objection to that amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. You propose to strike out the word "in" and then down to the words "United States," in line 3, on page 5, and to insert in lieu thereof what words?

Mr. FORAKER. After the words "be sued" I propose to insert the words "as such."

Mr. MORGAN. You do not strike out "in."

Mr. FORAKER. Yes; I strike out "in."

Mr. COCKRELL. They are not going to sue then, anywhere?

Mr. FORAKER. They will sue in any court with jurisdiction under the clause as we propose to amend it.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will pardon me, that of itself might not be an objectionable amendment; but if it is, as I think it would necessarily be, taken in connection with the amendment previously suggested by the Senator, then it would be open to objection. In other words, the amendment previously proposed by the Senator, to which I made objection, inserted words which practically struck out all provision making the Puerto Ricans citizens of the United States. It endeavored to interpolate the words "citizens of Puerto Rico, and as such entitled to the protection of the United States." It seems to me that the amendment suggested by the Senator would necessarily have some reference to the status as it would be fixed by that amendment, if adopted.

Mr. FORAKER. No. If the Senator will allow me, I can understand how that may have struck the Senator's mind; but the two amendments had no reference to each other at all in the mind of the party proposing them.

If the Senator will look at the three lines proposed to be stricken out by this amendment at the top of page 5, he will see that there is an error in the provision that is there made; and it was to cure that that this proposed amendment is offered. The provision as it now stands in the bill is "to sue and be sued in the courts of the United States in all cases in which such courts have jurisdiction, where one of the parties is a State or Territory of the United States."

I was having in mind when I drafted the bill the constitutional provision as to the right of a State suing in the Supreme Court of the United States; but when I came to look at it, I discovered what I ought to have known without looking, that Territories are

not empowered to sue at all. The provision is only with respect to the Supreme Court. I thought the entire purpose was subserved by simply giving them the power to sue and be sued as a body politic; and then it would be a question of jurisdiction. They can sue in any court that has jurisdiction of the subject-matter.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I think the construction made by me is one capable of being taken in the case of that amendment; but I submit to the Senator that if that is the purpose and limit of it, I should have no objection.

Mr. FORAKER. That is the sole purpose. We had no other.

Mr. BACON. And the limit?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. I propose to amend, in line 4, section 4, on page 5, after the word "ordinances," by inserting the words "of Puerto Rico;" and in the same line, after the word "force," by striking out the words "in Puerto Rico."

The only purpose of this amendment is to transpose the words "of Puerto Rico" and to correct the phrase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed amendment?

Mr. COCKRELL. How would the bill then read?

Mr. FORAKER. It would then read:

That the laws and ordinances of Puerto Rico now in force shall continue in full force and effect.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is right.

Mr. FORAKER. This refers to the laws of Spain which are already in force there. There will not be any laws of our enactment. The words "of Puerto Rico" are simply descriptive of the laws. I have no objection to the words "now in force" being retained.

Mr. BACON. As I understand the Senator's suggestion, that is intended to have reference solely to the laws which were in existence when Puerto Rico was a part of the territory of Spain?

Mr. FORAKER. Solely. The Senator will see by reading the next two or three lines that it could not have any other reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be agreed to, if there be no objection.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the amendment may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, in section 4, line 4, after the word "ordinances," it is proposed to insert the words "of Puerto Rico;" and after the word "force," in the same line, to strike out "in Puerto Rico;" so that if amended it will read:

That the laws and ordinances of Puerto Rico now in force shall continue in full force and effect, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BACON. I want to suggest to the Senator whether possibly language might not be inserted there which would make the intention beyond the possibility of question? The use of the word "now" might possibly mislead. I suggest that the Senator use words which will indicate the intention to have reference to the Spanish laws in Puerto Rico which existed prior to the treaty of peace.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me, the title of the laws is "The Laws of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines." That is the technical name of the laws now in force.

Mr. BACON. I only made the suggestion.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator thinks, after looking it over, that the language is not sufficiently clear, I shall have no objection to an amendment to it; only, I think he will find that it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment now pending, the previous amendment having been agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. As a further amendment, I move to strike out the whole of section 5 and to insert in lieu thereof what I send to the desk to be read.

I will state that section 5 provides for the extension of the laws of the United States relating to commerce, navigation, etc. They are already extended, I will say by way of explanation, by another clause of this bill, which extends all laws not locally inapplicable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out section 5, as follows:

SEC. 5. That the laws of the United States relating to commerce, navigation, and merchant seamen are hereby extended to and over Puerto Rico, and the Commissioner of Navigation may make such regulations as he may deem expedient for the nationalization of all vessels owned by the inhabitants of Puerto Rico on the 11th day of April, 1899, and which continued to be so owned up to the date of such nationalization, and the coasting trade between Puerto Rico and any other portion of the United States shall be regulated in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to such trade between any two great coasting districts;

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 5. That the Commissioner of Navigation shall make such regulations, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, as he may deem expedient for the nationalization of all vessels owned by the inhabitants of Puerto Rico on the 11th day of April, 1899, and which continued to be so owned

up to the date of such nationalization, and for the admission of the same to all of the benefits of the coasting trade of the United States, and the coasting trade between Puerto Rico and the United States shall be regulated in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to such trade between any two great coasting districts.

Mr. FORAKER. That is, in the United States.

Mr. BACON. "Trade coasting?"

Mr. FORAKER. No; "great coasting districts." The statute on that subject divides the United States into three great coasting districts.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the amendment be again read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again read the amendment.

The Secretary again read the amendment of Mr. FORAKER.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator from Alabama suggests that there be added at the end of what I have proposed the words "of the United States." I have no objection to that.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask whether any order has been made by which the amendments of the committee should have the right of way?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator that the bill, being the unfinished business, was taken up in its regular order, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] stated that he would propose certain amendments to the bill on behalf of the committee; that the amendments which were objected to would go over, and that those which were not objected to would be adopted, so that the bill could be printed as amended.

Mr. ALLEN. Ordinarily, as I understand, it is customary for the Senator in charge of a bill to ask and obtain leave that the committee amendments be first considered. Has such an order as that been made in this case?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes; as to the original text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent was given, the Chair will inform the Senator from Nebraska, that that course should be pursued.

Mr. ALLEN. I wanted to call the attention of the Senator from Ohio in that connection to section 3. I do not know that it is in order to do so now. That section defines the citizenship of the island of Puerto Rico.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me, that section was passed over a while ago under the objection of some Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well. I think possibly, then, what I desire to say ought to be submitted in connection with that objection.

Mr. FORAKER. That may be.

Mr. ALLEN. I wanted to direct particular attention to this language. Speaking of the people of that island, the bill says:

And they, together with such other citizens of the United States as may reside in Puerto Rico, shall constitute a body politic under the name of The People of Puerto Rico, with governmental powers as hereinafter conferred, and with power to sue and be sued, etc.

What is to be the character, if any, of the government of Puerto Rico? What is to be its classification? Is it to be a district, a colony, a Territory, a State, or a mere province or dependency?

Mr. FORAKER. It is not by the language of this bill given any name except the name of Puerto Rico.

Mr. ALLEN. I observe that.

Mr. FORAKER. That is to say, it is not called a district; it is not called a Territory; it is not called any particular kind of a political subdivision.

Mr. ALLEN. I observe the absence of classification, and I do not know whether it was the result of accident or design.

Mr. FORAKER. It was the result of design.

Mr. ALLEN. I think that is true, probably.

Right here, Mr. President, I want to protest, as one Senator, that we ought not to run away from the question of settling the political status and the classification of that island. I doubt if there can be found in the history of the United States a bill drawn exactly as this bill has been drawn. The island is to be a political entity known as the people of Puerto Rico. What relation do those people hold to the United States? What is the island of Puerto Rico; that is, what is its relation to the United States? Certainly, Mr. President, if we want to follow precedents it must be a Territory, unless we follow the late precedents in the cases of Alaska and the Sandwich Islands.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me just a moment, I think he was not in the Chamber when this bill was taken up for consideration under an agreement that we would consider this afternoon only such amendments and provisions of the bill as there would be no debate about, the idea being simply to get some phrases corrected and some minor amendments made that we thought no one would object to. It was also taken up under an agreement that at 4 o'clock—which is only five minutes off—other business should be transacted. I do not want to interfere with the Senator addressing the Senate at his pleasure, and at whatever length he pleases, but I should like to have these amendments acted upon if he has no special objection.

Mr. ALLEN. I certainly will not violate any unanimous-consent agreement, and shall gladly oblige the Senator from Ohio, as I know he would oblige me.

Mr. FORAKER. I am much obliged to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would state that there is an amendment pending which has not been agreed to nor passed over. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. FORAKER. I ask that it be again stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was to add to the new section inserted as section 5 the words "of the United States."

Mr. FORAKER. That was agreed to, I believe, without objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not aware that it was agreed to. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of asking a question for information. Section 5, which is proposed to be stricken out, is one which extends the navigation laws of the United States to Puerto Rico. That is the broad intention of it, as I understand?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BACON. Now, the amendment proposed is one which has the purpose of extending the registration laws to vessels owned in Puerto Rico at a certain date. As to that, I should suppose there would be no objection. The question I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio is—it is very difficult to understand the purport of an amendment simply from hearing it read from the desk—whether or not the additional language, other than that to which I have just alluded with reference to the registration of vessels, is intended to accomplish the same result as that which is now accomplished by section 5, or whether it proposes in any manner to change the section?

Mr. FORAKER. It is precisely the same as before. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that section 12 of this bill extends all the laws of the United States not locally inapplicable to Puerto Rico, and I did not want to repeat the provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio will be agreed to. The Chair hears no objection, and it is agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. I now propose, on page 13, in line 7, section 16, after the word "President," to insert "for a like term of four years."

I will say, in explanation of this amendment, that it relates to the tenure of office of five of the persons to be appointed as members of the executive council, the other six members being bureau officers, the tenure of office as to each having been fixed at four years. It was a mere oversight in reporting the bill to fail to fix any tenure for the other members of the executive council; and so I propose to insert the words "for a like term of four years."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. BACON. I hope the amendment will not be considered as having been finally acted upon. It is a matter of some importance. We have not the amendments before us to consider them properly, and I simply desire to have the last amendment go over.

Mr. FORAKER. I have no objection to passing it over, if the Senator wants to look at it further.

Mr. BACON. I should rather that would be done, and that it should go over for the present.

Mr. FORAKER. I think the Senator will find that he will have no objection to it when he looks at it; and if so, I shall be glad to have it adopted. That amendment is passed over, as I understand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. FORAKER. On page 17, section 27, line 4, I propose to amend by inserting after the word "who"—this relates to the qualifications of voters, I will say for the information and benefit of Senators—in line 4, page 17, after the word "who," by inserting "have been bona fide residents for one year, and who;" so as to read:

At such elections all citizens of Puerto Rico shall be allowed to vote who have been bona fide residents for one year, and who possess, etc.

Then, after the word "the," I move to insert "other;" so as to read:

Who possess the other qualifications of voters under the laws and military orders in force, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. I move to further amend by inserting after the word "such," in line 6 of the same section, on page 17, the words "modifications and."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BACON. I may misunderstand the Senator. It is very difficult, without having the amendment before us, to thoroughly comprehend them. I understand, though, that the amendment would put it in the power of the executive council, an appointive body, to change the qualifications of voters.

Mr. FORAKER. From what they are now as fixed by military

order. That I thought was quite proper, because they have an order in force there fixing not only an educational, but a property qualification.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator means only to change the military order, that is correct; but I ask him to examine the language and see whether it does or not. The language is this: "The qualifications of voters under the laws and military orders." That would include the right to modify not only military orders, but all laws.

Mr. FORAKER. It would, yes; but under the law as it existed before any military orders were made, every male over 21 years of age had the right to vote without regard to whether or not he could read or write or had property. By the order of General Davis certain qualifications for those over 21 years of age were prescribed. Another qualification was that the person should be able to read and write or that he should own property; and in that order it was provided that no one should vote who had not been a bona fide resident for two years. I am intending there simply to provide, making it symmetrical, so as to make whatever other modifications may be necessary, that any citizen of Puerto Rico who has had a bona fide residence there for one year before the election may have the right to vote, as is the case in all of our States probably.

Mr. BACON. Does the Senator understand that this relates to the first election?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes, sir; that is, the legislature after that can fix any qualifications it sees fit. The provision relates only to one election.

Mr. BACON. The reason I asked the question was that the plural is used there.

Mr. FORAKER. There are elections for members of the house of delegates.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask the Senator from Ohio whether his bill has now reached a stage where it would stand being put aside for a little while?

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me about five minutes longer, I think I can get through with the amendments. I propose to amend further, on page 19, section 30, line 23, after the word "also." This is the provision relating to the granting of franchises. It provides:

That all grants of franchises, rights, and privileges or concessions of a public or quasi-public nature shall be made by the executive council, with the approval of the governor, subject also to the approval of the President of the United States, who shall report the same to Congress.

I want to insert, after the word "also," in line 23, the following: "as to railroad, telegraph, and telephone franchises;" the purpose of this amendment being to require only the more important ones to come here, and not to make it necessary for the others to do so.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to know where that amendment comes in?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, in that same connection there is an amendment proposed that instead of the executive council there shall be a legislative assembly.

Mr. FORAKER. I hope the Senator will not insist upon that, the idea being that the executive council is constantly in a situation to act, but the legislature can not act, except when in session, and it is only allowed to be in session sixty days.

Mr. PETTUS. The things we are dealing with now concern the vital interests of those people, and all proper safeguards ought to be thrown around these franchises. I object to an amendment limiting this provision to railroads and other corporations of that sort, for the reason that the limitation ought to extend to all; it ought to be with the approval of the President, at least, as to all these franchises.

Mr. FORAKER. If the amendment proposed should be adopted, the minor franchises—for instance, to a gas company or to an electric lighting company—in a small municipality could be disposed of finally by the action of the executive council or the governor; but as to all franchises that are intermunicipal, extending through the island, such as railroads, telegraphs, and telephones, they would be required to be approved by the President.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that amendment be considered pending.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator wants to object to it, I will suspend here, in order that the Senator from Colorado may make the motion he desires to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty-two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 20, 1900, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 19, 1900.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

George F. Bartlett, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of New Bedford, in the State of Massachusetts, to succeed Zephaniah W. Pease, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

James Brady, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Fall River, in the State of Massachusetts, to succeed John Desmond, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

Obed G. Smith, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Nantucket, in the State of Massachusetts, in place of Charles E. Smalley, deceased.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Theodore W. Wheeler, of New York, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Port Jefferson, in the State of New York, to succeed G. Frank Bayles, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

This nomination is made to correct error in name of Mr. Wheeler, who was nominated and confirmed by the Senate March 5, 1900, as Thomas W. Wheeler.

INDIAN INSPECTOR.

J. George Wright, of Rosebud Agency, South Dakota, to be an Indian inspector, to take effect March 27, 1900, at the expiration of his present term of office. (Reappointment.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

Thirty-fifth Infantry.

Sergt. Selwyn D. Smith, Company C, Thirty-fifth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, March 16, 1900, vice Kimball, promoted.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of first lieutenant.

Stanley Mac C. Stuart, of the District of Columbia, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, March 16, 1900, vice Beasley, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, promoted.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Washburn Maynard, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 9th day of March, 1900, vice Capt. George M. Book, retired.

Maj. Benjamin R. Russell, to be a lieutenant-colonel in the United States Marine Corps, from the 31st day of January, 1900 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Col. William S. Muse, promoted.

Capt. Charles A. Doyen, to be a major in the United States Marine Corps, from the 31st day of January, 1900, vice Maj. Benjamin R. Russell, promoted.

Mr. Thomas H. Brown, a citizen of Maryland, to be a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps, from the 19th day of March, 1900, to fill a vacancy existing in that corps.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 19, 1900.

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE.

John H. O'Donnell, of the District of Columbia, to be a justice of the peace in the District of Columbia (assigned to the city of Washington).

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Private Ferdinand W. Fonda, Troop B, Third United States Cavalry, to be second lieutenant, March 1, 1900.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. William A. Marye, Ordnance Department, to be colonel, March 5, 1900.

Maj. John A. Kress, Ordnance Department, to be lieutenant-colonel, March 5, 1900.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Louis P. Schindel, Sixth Infantry, October 19, 1899.

Second Lieut. George B. Pond, Third Infantry, October 20, 1899.

Second Lieut. Dana T. Merrill, Twelfth Infantry, November 15, 1899.

Second Lieut. Alexander M. Wetherill, Sixth Infantry, November 15, 1899.

Second Lieut. Charles N. Murphy, Twenty-second Infantry, November 15, 1899.

Second Lieut. Theodore A. Baldwin, jr., Twenty-fourth Infantry, November 20, 1899.

Second Lieut. George H. Shields, jr., Twelfth Infantry, November 25, 1899.

Second Lieut. Eleutheros H. Cooke, Tenth Infantry, November 26, 1899.

Second Lieut. Arthur L. Conger, Eighteenth Infantry, December 2, 1899.

Second Lieut. James B. Kemper, Fourteenth Infantry, December 8, 1899.

Second Lieut. John W. Barnes, Eighteenth Infantry, December 15, 1899.

Second Lieut. Isaac A. Saxton, Fourth Infantry, December 15, 1899.

Second Lieut. George E. Thorne, Twenty-second Infantry, December 18, 1899.

Second Lieut. Harry S. Howland, Twenty-third Infantry, December 23, 1899.

Second Lieut. Alfred Aloe, Eighteenth Infantry, December 26, 1899.

Second Lieut. Thomas J. Fealy, Fifth Infantry, January 7, 1900.

Second Lieut. Frank W. Rowell, Second Infantry, January 12, 1900.

Second Lieut. Hugh A. Drum, Twelfth Infantry, January 15, 1900.

Second Lieut. John M. Campbell, Twenty-fifth Infantry, January 18, 1900.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

To be assistant surgeon with the rank of captain.

José Lugo Vina, of Puerto Rico, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, March 1, 1900, Puerto Rico Regiment, United States Volunteer Infantry.

PUERTO RICO REGIMENT.

Capt. William E. Almy, Fifth United States Cavalry, to be major, Puerto Rico Regiment, United States Volunteer Infantry, March 1, 1900.

THIRTY-NINTH INFANTRY.

Corp. Frank M. Polk, Company C, Thirty-ninth Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, March 5, 1900.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Bolivar J. Lloyd, of Texas, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Thomas D. Berry, of Texas, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Mervin W. Glover, of West Virginia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

POSTMASTERS.

John Campbell, to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Trumbull and State of Ohio.

Simeon Chapman, to be postmaster at Westerville, in the county of Franklin and State of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, March 19, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi indefinitely, on account of illness.

HEIRS AT LAW OF DUNCAN CAMPBELL.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6497) for the relief of the heirs at law of the late Duncan H. Campbell.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Patents is hereby authorized and directed to grant and issue to Annie Campbell, widow of Duncan Campbell, an extension of Letters Patent No. 231954, issued September 7, 1880, and Letters Patent No. 253156, issued January 31, 1882, for the full term of seven years from and after the date of the expiration of each of said letters patent, and that said letters patent be, and the same hereby are, extended for the term of seven years after the said respective dates of expiration: *Provided*, That said extension of said letters patent and all the benefits of this act shall be held to apply only to the use and benefit of said Annie Campbell, widow of Duncan Campbell.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I demand a second.

Mr. KERR. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk read the unanimous report of the Committee on Patents.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read in the time of the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6497) for the relief of the heirs at law of the late Duncan Campbell, beg leave to submit the following report, and recommend that said bill do pass, with amendments:

Duncan H. Campbell, late of the city of Pawtucket, in the State of Rhode Island, was a native of Scotland and a naturalized citizen of the United States, who obtained Letters Patent No. 231954 September 7, 1880, for a sewing machine, the particular value of which was in the fact that it successfully carried and operated a waxed thread. He also obtained, on January 31, 1882, Letters Patent No. 231156 for a wax thread sewing machine. Three-fourths interest in each of these inventions was assigned to other parties, namely, H. B. Metcalf, Frank E. Comey, and Daniel McNiven, for nominal consideration, upon condition that a company or corporation should be formed to exploit said inventions and manufacture said machines, in which company or corporation said Campbell should have a certain amount of stock, should be a director, and should receive continuous employment at a compensation to be agreed upon.

This company was formed, and to it were assigned the patents herein referred to. It entered upon the transaction of its business, and for some time said Campbell was employed and enjoyed all the rights contemplated for him in the original agreement, in the meantime working other and different inventions, among them a so-called welt machine of great value. These subsequent inventions were claimed to be included in the original agreement, and, it was claimed by the company, should be at once assigned without further consideration. This was resisted by Mr. Campbell, and the committee do not find that the contention of the company is sustained by the evidence presented. Mr. Campbell resisting this demand, the relations between himself and the directors of the company became strained to such an extent that he was dropped from membership in the board of trustees, and said board, without authority except its own will, arbitrarily canceled the contract of employment with said Campbell, and also canceled all other contracts between them, but without restoring to said Campbell any of his former rights under said letters patent.

From the best evidence obtainable Mr. Campbell was denied all participation in the affairs of the company, and was notified that no transfers of stock by him would be recognized by the company. This action rendered the stock held by him of comparatively small value, and from that time up to his death, in 1894, he received nothing from said company either in the way of salary, dividends on stock, or otherwise, nor has his widow received anything since. Dividends have been passed or suspended, although the inventions are of great value and sources of much revenue to the company.

The evidence before the committee tends to show that while the company has, perhaps, avoided strict legal liability, its treatment of the widow of said Campbell has not been such as in equity and good conscience she should be entitled to. She is in needy circumstances, and therefore, inasmuch as your committee believe that one object of the patent laws is to protect the pecuniary interest of inventors, who are not always possessed of that business acumen which seems to characterize certain other classes of men, and inasmuch as this bill involves no appropriation and works no hardship to any parties concerned, and inasmuch, perhaps, as it tends to remedy the distressed condition of the widow of a worthy but unfortunate inventor, the bill will address itself to the sense of justice of anyone.

Your committee would further report that in the Fifty-fourth Congress the Senate Committee on Patents favorably reported the bill, and at least one favorable report on the bill was made by one of the former Committees on Patents of this House, all of which is suggested as an evidence of the merits of the bill.

Your committee do therefore recommend that the following amendments be adopted and that the bill do pass:

In line 4, page 1, after the words "Annie Campbell," add the words "widow of."

In line 5, page 1, strike out all of said line, commencing with the name "Hector Campbell."

Also, strike out all of line 6.

Also, strike out all of line 7, same page, down to and including the word "assigns."

After the word "expiration" in line 17, page 1, add the following words: "Provided, That said extension of said letters patent and all the benefits of this act shall be held to apply only to the use and benefit of said Annie Campbell, widow of Duncan Campbell."

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection to the passage of the bill, I will ask for a vote, and will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have sent for a copy of the bill and report, but have been unable to get either. It is almost impossible to learn the effect of this bill from the reading. I should like to have some explanation of it from the gentleman.

First, I should like to know if this motion to suspend the rules is made by the direction of the committee or is an individual motion?

Mr. KERR. It is a motion made by direction of the committee. I will say to the gentleman that the committee simply recommended some formal amendments.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Did the committee unanimously report this bill?

Mr. KERR. They did. One or two members of the committee have some objections on general principles to the extension of a patent, but against this particular bill there was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am unable to get a copy of the bill, and I should like the gentleman to give us some explanation of it more full than we have heard.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Will not the passage of this bill result—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. KERR. I yield first to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will not the passage of this

bill result in depriving the assignees under the original patent of some rights acquired by them?

Mr. KERR. Not at all. The original patents have expired and the assignees have reaped all the benefits they were entitled to under those patents.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Did not the contract between the patentee and his associates contemplate a renewal of the patent?

Mr. KERR. No; I think not—not as I recollect it. There was an assignment of the original terms of the two patents, and those have expired, one expiring some three years ago and the last one last year.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Is there an effort being made by the assignees of the original patent to renew it?

Mr. KERR. Not so far as I know. There has been no application brought to the attention of the Committee on Patents.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Was the invention assigned at the same time that the patent was assigned?

Mr. KERR. The patents were assigned some time before the decease of the husband of the beneficiary under this bill, and the basis of the bill is that by an entirely unfair proceeding he was deprived of his interest in the patents.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Was the invention assigned by the patentee?

Mr. KERR. Certainly; the patents and the invention were assigned to this company in which Mr. Campbell was originally an associate or partner. It was an association or incorporation, and it appears that Mr. Campbell was unjustly deprived of his interest in the company.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman, if the invention was assigned, what right the widow of the inventor has to a renewal of the patent?

Mr. KERR. She would have exactly the same right as anybody else would have, if the House thinks it proper to renew it. The committee made a very careful investigation of this question and looked into it thoroughly. Not only that, but the Committee on Patents in the Fifty-fourth Congress, as I recollect it, and in the Fifty-fifth Congress, committees differing very largely from the committee that now exists, made a careful and thorough examination in the case and unanimously recommended the passage of the bill.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I want to vote for the bill; I am not antagonizing it; but I should like to know what right the widow has to a renewal of the patent?

Mr. KERR. In a former Congress, the Fifty-fourth Congress, the Senate Committee on Patents also investigated the matter, and made a unanimous report in favor of the bill. So that it seems to me that the subject-matter has been thoroughly investigated, and there can not exist any very weighty objection to the bill, except upon the general proposition of objection to the extension of patents.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. But I will say that if the original inventor not only assigned the patent but the invention, I can not see how his widow has any right to make an application for an extension of the patent.

Mr. KERR. Well, the gentleman makes a distinction I fail to understand, though I have had some considerable experience in patent matters. He simply assigned the patents for a nominal consideration to these three gentlemen, and the four afterwards formed a company, and the stock was divided among the four. Soon after the organization of this company it turned out to be a profitable patent, and the three, by a proceeding that was entirely unfair, the committee have found, excluded Campbell from all profit or benefit in this company, and so long as he lived he never received any benefit out of the agreement; but these gentlemen, who were the stockholders of the company, continued to receive benefit from the patents until they expired. This bill, in some form or another, in one House or the other, has been before the Congress for some years, and has been recommended by two committees; and whatever delay there has been is on account of the difficulty that has been met of getting a bill through, not because anybody had any serious objection to it, so far as developed, and I have had a great deal to do with it for the last two or three Congresses. I think it is a good bill, and ought to pass.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield the gentleman from Missouri such time as he desires.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make only two or three remarks about the extension of patents in general. This particular case is just about as meritorious as most of the applications for extension of patents are. I notified the chairman of the committee that in another case, while I would not take the trouble to make a minority report, I would reserve the right to fight all these extensions of patents on the floor of the House. I wish to state this to the members of the House. There are a very large number of applications now, in one way and another, for the extension of patents, and my own opinion about it is that our patent laws are broad enough and liberal enough now, and the way that

these requests for extension of patents usually come up is this, that the patentee or the assignee of the patent sleeps on his rights for several years. They generally make a fortune out of the patent, and then, when the time has expired, which is long enough, they come to Congress and say that they have not made enough.

Now, that is substantially the case of every application that is made to that committee, and while, as the committee said in their report, a bill like this does not call for any appropriation by Congress of the moneys of the United States Government, every man with ordinary intelligence knows that the effect of every patent, almost, is to make somebody in some way pay for it. As a matter of historical fact, some of the most valuable patents ever issued by the Patent Office have been extended by acts of Congress. Men who study about these matters must come to the conclusion that the patent laws of the United States as they exist are sufficiently liberal to incite inventive genius to do its very best, and it appears to me, without worrying the House with any extended remarks, that there ought to be some extraordinarily good reason to induce Congress in a special case to overrule the general law that it has laid down to govern all these patent cases, and my own opinion about it is that this case presents no sufficient reason to make an exception in favor of this woman to the general law on patents.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill with the amendments recommended by the committee.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Mr. KERR. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 50, noes 53.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was lost.

SOUTH MANCHESTER, CONN., A PORT OF DELIVERY.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2114) to constitute South Manchester, Conn., a port of delivery.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That South Manchester, Conn., be, and is hereby, constituted a port of delivery in the customs collection district of Hartford, Conn., and that the privileges of the seventh section of the act approved June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," be, and they are hereby, extended to said port of South Manchester.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, it was passed.

On motion of Mr. HENRY of Connecticut, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask that House bill 8567, similar in terms, be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that House bill 8567, relating to the same subject, lie upon the table. Without objection, this order will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS rose.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Indiana suspend a moment? The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR, has a request, and he is anxious to leave, as he is not well.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the debate on the Puerto Rican bill general leave was given to extend remarks in the RECORD for a period of ten days. It is well known to the House that during eight of those ten days I was confined to my bed with sickness. I now ask unanimous consent that I may have the time extended until a week from to-day to print a speech on the topic, wholly pertinent to the Puerto Rico question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio states that during the pendency of the order of the House given ten days ago to print observations on the Puerto Rico bill he was confined to his hotel with illness. He now asks unanimous consent that he may have until a week from to-day to print remarks on this subject. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

C. E. MARR AND E. H. PIERCE.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1740, to authorize C. E. Marr and E. H. Pierce to accept silver watches awarded to them by the government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of their services in rescuing British sailors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That C. E. Marr and E. H. Pierce, keepers of the Cuckolds, Maine, fog-signal station, be, and are hereby, authorized to accept each a silver watch awarded to them, respectively, by the government of the

Dominion of Canada in recognition of their services in rescuing the captain and crew of the schooner *Aurora*, of Harboursville, Nova Scotia, on January 4, 1896.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if this is the same bill that he presented some days ago?

Mr. LANDIS. It is the same bill.

The SPEAKER. Will the House please be in order? Will gentlemen take their seats and cease conversation? There is no class of business where the House should be in better order than in cases where unanimous consent is asked, so that the members may hear what is proposed.

Mr. LANDIS. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that this is the same bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I asked the gentleman for some information then as to where these persons resided, and he was not able to state. I hope now he will make a statement about it.

Mr. LANDIS. I will say this to the gentleman from Tennessee: These men were light keepers at Cuckolds fog-signal station, Maine, and on January 4, 1896, near Southport, they rescued the captain and seamen of the wrecked schooner *Aurora*. Application was made to Congress in December, 1894, for the passage of the bill authorizing these men to accept the watches awarded them by the government of the Dominion of Canada, and although it received the approval of the Secretary of State, no action was taken upon it at that time. On December 13, 1899, the request was renewed by Secretary Hay, and the bill passed the Senate January 30, 1900.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, it was passed.

On motion of Mr. LANDIS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

C. R. DOBBINS.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 746) to authorize C. R. Dobbins to accept a gold watch awarded to him by the government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of his humane and gallant services to the shipwrecked crew of the British schooner *Ashton*, of Weymouth, Nova Scotia.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That C. R. Dobbins, keeper of the light station at Moose Peak, Maine, be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept a gold watch awarded to him by the government of the Dominion of Canada, in recognition of his humane and gallant services to the shipwrecked crew of the British schooner *Ashton*, of Weymouth, Nova Scotia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before consent is given, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if this case belongs to the same class as the one just considered?

Mr. LANDIS. The same class, and the circumstances are very much the same.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I notice that there is a difference in the style of the watches.

Mr. LANDIS. Yes; the others were silver watches, and this is a gold watch.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Why this difference?

Mr. LANDIS. The value of silver bullion having declined so perceptibly since the circumstances which led to the recognition, the Canadian government thought that it would be more in keeping to give a gold watch. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is that all the reason?

Mr. LANDIS. I presume so; I think that is sufficient. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, it was passed.

On motion of Mr. LANDIS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3254. An act to amend section 953 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the signing of a bill of exceptions; and

S. 3106. An act relating to the accounts of United States marshals and the clerks of the district courts for the Territory of Utah.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with

amendments a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 5390. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria E. Mailley.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 854. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. McCormick;

H. R. 2477. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Pennington;

H. R. 3967. An act granting an increase of pension to Melvina Bottles;

H. R. 6575. An act granting a pension to Matilda G. Higbee;

H. R. 5509. An act granting a pension to Malinda Jones;

H. R. 2749. An act granting a pension to Susan Garrison;

H. R. 4416. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Geeson;

H. R. 524. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Davis;

H. R. 5156. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances C. Kirby;

H. R. 3072. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Wharton;

H. R. 2000. An act for the relief of Thomas Paul;

H. R. 3071. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Nelson;

H. R. 5299. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph McCune;

H. R. 309. An act granting a pension to James M. Kercheval; and H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution to provide for the removal of snow and ice in the city of Washington, D. C.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARNEY. I desire to call the attention of the House to House bill No. 6627, making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes. As will be remembered, this bill was passed by the House several weeks ago and sent to the Senate. It has been returned to the House with certain amendments, and now lies on the Speaker's table. I ask unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the amendments of the Senate and ask a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the amendments of the Senate to this bill and ask a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. BARNEY, Mr. MCCLEARY, and Mr. BELL as conferees on the part of the House.

STEAMER THETIS.

Mr. CANNON. By direction of the Committee on Appropriations I report back, with a recommendation that it pass, the bill (S. 3138) to provide for necessary repairs to the steamer *Thetis* for service as a revenue cutter. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated and made immediately available, for the purposes of repairing and equipping the steamer *Thetis* for service as a vessel of the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does this bill come from the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is it unanimously reported?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, sir.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUERTO RICAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. There is upon the Speaker's table what is known as the Puerto Rican appropriation bill, which was passed by the House several weeks ago and is now returned from the Senate with amendments. I desire to call up that bill, to move that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9080) appropriating for the benefit and government of Puerto Rico revenues collected on importations therefrom since its evacuation by Spain, and revenues hereafter collected on such importations under existing law.

The amendments of the Senate were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out all after "hundred," down to and including "law," line 12.

Page 2, line 1, after "government," insert "now existing and which may

hereafter be established in Puerto Rico, and for public education, public works, and other governmental and public purposes therein."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "and benefit of Puerto Rico until otherwise provided by law."

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "revenues herein referred to, already collected and to be collected under existing law, are" and insert "said sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is."

Amend the title so as to read:

"An act appropriating for the benefit and government of Puerto Rico, customs revenues collected on importations therefrom since its evacuation by Spain to the 1st day of January, 1900."

Mr. McRAE. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] moves to nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] moves to concur. The vote will first be taken on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. McRAE. Will the gentleman from Illinois indicate how much time will be allowed for debate?

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad to have as speedy action as possible on this bill, but I will yield to the gentleman. How much time does he desire?

Mr. McRAE. So far as I am personally concerned, I desire but very little. But some gentlemen on this side desire to discuss the matter; it is not possible just now to say how long—not very long.

Mr. CANNON. How much time probably is desired on that side?

Mr. McRAE. We will try to get along with thirty minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Say twenty-five. I have an hour in my own right. I want to occupy a little of that time myself and I also want time enough to hold parliamentarily the power to test the sense of the House as to a vote. I have no objection to allowing twenty-eight minutes on a side.

Mr. McRAE. All right.

Mr. CANNON. I will occupy a very brief time and then yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, on the 9th day of March the House passed a bill (H. R. 9080) appropriating, for the benefit and government of Puerto Rico, revenues collected on importations therefrom since its evacuation by Spain, and revenues hereafter collected on such importations under existing law.

It will be remembered that the House appropriated by this bill \$2,095,000, in round numbers, "being the amount of customs revenue received on importations by the United States from Puerto Rico since the evacuation of Puerto Rico by the Spanish forces on the 18th day of October, 1898, to the 1st of January, 1900."

In addition to this, the following language was in the bill:

Together with any further customs revenue collected on importations from Puerto Rico since the 1st of January, 1900, or that shall hereafter be collected under existing law.

The Senate considered this bill, and amended it by striking out these words:

Together with any further customs revenue collected on importations from Puerto Rico since the 1st of January, 1900, or that shall hereafter be collected under existing law.

It will be noticed that the House not only appropriated all revenues which had been collected up to the 1st of January, but appropriated the revenues which had been collected on these importations from that time to the time of the enactment of the law, if it shall be enacted. The House bill went further, and appropriated all revenues that should be or shall be hereafter collected upon such importations under existing law.

The Senate strikes out these provisions. The Senate also amends as follows: It provides that the revenues shall be placed at the disposal of the President, to be used for the government.

Now comes the Senate amendment:

Now existing and which may hereafter be established in Puerto Rico, and for public education, public works, and other governmental and public purposes therein.

The House language was:

To be used for the government and benefit of Puerto Rico until otherwise provided by law.

This amendment of the Senate, in legal effect, in my judgment, does not change the House provisions; and if that had been the only amendment I should have voted to concur in the same. It is a mere difference in phraseology.

But the material amendment is the one that I first referred to. Now, the House believed it to be very proper to devote the revenues collected under the Dingley law upon importations from Puerto Rico, to devote the money that had been collected and the money that shall be collected, until the law is changed, to the same purpose. The Senate, however, by its amendment stops with the devotion of these revenues to this purpose up to the 1st of January.

In my judgment it is perfectly clear that if the revenues should be devoted to the benefit of Puerto Rico up to the 1st of January, they should, upon the same principle and for the same reason, be devoted to the benefit of Puerto Rico under existing law and until the law is changed. Therefore, my motion was to nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask a conference with the Senate

upon those amendments. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] moves to concur in the amendments. His motion, if adopted, would at once pass the law. My motion, if adopted, would send it to a committee of conference with a view upon the part of the House to ask the Senate to recede from its amendment and cover the whole subject as the House covered it when it passed the bill.

I will now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] twenty-eight minutes.

Mr. McRAE. I only want to say a few words myself. Both these propositions concede that the money that has been collected ought to be refunded. The House bill is indefinite as to what may be collected and refunded. The Senate proposition is definite as to the amount and time. The House proposition implies the right of the United States to enforce the Dingley tariff bill against the Puerto Ricans. The Senate proposition does not concede that, and for this, if no other, reason I prefer the Senate amendments. These are important distinctions. We are all in favor of giving the money back to the Puerto Ricans, and I believe I can speak for every man on this side when I say that not only would we give them back what has been unjustly taken from them by unequal taxes, but that we would at once stop any further collections under the Dingley law and give them what they have asked for and what they are entitled to—free trade with the United States, of which they are part. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] five minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no question, I think, in the mind of anybody but that the phraseology of this bill is wonderfully improved by the Senate amendments. The Senate bill also prescribes the general application of the funds. It makes an appropriation of what has been collected, of over \$200,000,000. Now, there is an underlying feature of this bill that is more important than this appropriation. That is, that this bill as amended really anticipates that we propose, at an early date, to enact a law giving those people civil government, and the Puerto Ricans themselves are in favor of that.

I had the pleasure last night of listening to Dr. Ames, a resident of Puerto Rico, who spoke to an immense audience in this city. He held up our actions and contrasted them with the treatment which the Puerto Ricans received from Spain. He said they wanted no such charities as we offered them; that they came to the United States and asked what the great majority of the people and newspapers of the United States say we should give them. He showed that 93 per cent of the newspapers of the United States demand that Puerto Rico shall have free commerce with the United States.

But, say these parties, in addition to free trade the one thing above all others that Puerto Rico demands is a civil government; that free trade is not so important in Puerto Rico as a civil government for that island. The amendment of the Senate contemplates that we will appropriate the money collected, and then that we will make the machinery for the purpose of governing Puerto Rico and the necessary appropriations under that machinery. The Senate amendment also gives the President less leeway, and it provides that he shall use this money, or such part of it as may be necessary, for the purposes of education, public works of the government, and public purposes generally. It also contemplates the organization of a civil government, and gives this amount of money, or what is left, to the civil government for their disposition, when organized.

Now, sir, it seems to me that, instead of spending much time over a quibble, we should make the appropriation as contemplated by the Senate. When we have made the appropriation we should hurry to give the island of Puerto Rico a civil government. Dr. Ames, who is a resident of Puerto Rico, and who was a citizen of the United States before going there, said that under Spain they had laws that were unexceptionable, but it was the failure to execute the laws which made their hardships. He pointed out that they had four representatives in the higher legislative body in Spain and sixteen in the lower house, and he referred to us as attempting to humiliate the people of Puerto Rico as Spain never had descended to think of doing under her administration.

Now, sir, that put in my mind a thought. As Dr. Ames says, it was not the laws which were passed by Spain, but it was the failure to execute the laws passed by the Cortes in their true spirit that caused the oppression of the people of Puerto Rico. He says we may never expect harmony in Puerto Rico while they are governed by brass buttons and steel bayonets; that they want to govern themselves; that they want to do so immediately, and that they demand at our hands not these little contributions or begrudging charities, but a régime for the government of the island. I say, because this bill contemplates that, because it provides for this fund to be turned over to the contemplated régime, and because the language is more definite and the phraseology better, and because it attempts only to appropriate what we have collected heretofore, leaving it to Congress to make an appropriation of the future collections—for these reasons, it seems to me,

this bill is much preferable to the bill as it passed the House. Therefore, I am in favor of the Senate amendment. I am in favor of making this appropriation immediately, and allowing a little relief to these long-suffering people who are right at our door, and who are now suffering under our neglect and mistreatment. I hope we may concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BELL. Yes; certainly.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Are you opposed to giving them the revenues received since the 1st day of January and to be received hereafter?

Mr. BELL. I might be in favor of appropriating those at an opportune time.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Why not now?

Mr. BELL. We here appropriate \$2,000,000, more than enough for immediate needs, and we are forcing an appropriation upon a people who do not demand such an appropriation. They demand something higher and better, to wit, a civil government, after this appropriation. I am in favor of giving them civil government, and then taking off the duty and giving them these subsequent collections. But I have said enough. I can not consume the time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McRAE. How much time have I?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has twenty-one minutes remaining.

Mr. McRAE. I yield that time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BALL].

Mr. BALL. Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] make a motion to nonconcur in the Senate amendments. When the House bill was passed, on the 2d of March, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON] used this language:

I would be very glad for storm-swept, starving Puerto Rico that the bill should pass by unanimous consent without debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to relieve the necessities of "storm-swept, starving Puerto Rico" by concurring in the Senate amendments, which embody the principles voted for by the unanimous Democratic minority on this side of the Chamber when the original House bill was pending. That bill appropriated \$2,095,455.88, being the amount received on importations from Puerto Rico to the United States since the evacuation of that island by the Spanish forces to the 1st of January, 1900, together with any further customs thereafter collected under existing law, and placed the same at the disposal of the President, to be expended for the government and benefit of Puerto Rico.

The Democratic minority antagonized the bill because it continued the Dingley tariff bill in operation as to Puerto Rican imports and gave all sums already collected under that law and hereafter to be collected thereunder to be disbursed at the discretion of one man, the President. We were not willing to admit the right to apply the Dingley bill to that island, either in the past or in the future.

We were willing to appropriate the full amount which Puerto Rican products had already wrongfully paid, to the benefit of the people of Puerto Rico, provided the purposes for which the money was to be spent could be specified in the bill and not left to the discretion of the President. In behalf of the Democratic minority, when the original bill which passed the House was pending, my colleague from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] moved to recommit the bill at that time with instructions, and said:

I move that the bill be committed to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report it back with amendments limiting the appropriation to the amount now in the Treasury derived from collections upon articles imported from Puerto Rico, and specifying the purposes for which the President may use the money.

That amendment or substitute was voted for by every gentleman on this side of the Chamber, and has been specifically embodied in the substitute or amendment which the Senate of the United States has sent to this House for its consideration. The pending amendment does limit the amount to be appropriated to that already collected from imports from Puerto Rico, and specifies for what purpose the President shall spend these amounts.

Now, is it the purpose of the gentleman from Illinois or of the majority upon the other side of the Chamber, who accused us less than two weeks ago of "shedding crocodile tears over the distress of that island"—is it their purpose, let me ask, to delay action in order that relief may not come to the people, whom the gentleman from Illinois desired to relieve when the measure was pending two weeks ago, without even a moment's debate? I have in my hand an editorial from the New York Herald of to-day, which is as follows:

STARVING PUERTO RICO'S PLEA.

The plea of the 60 half-naked, famishing women who walked barefoot 25 miles to San Juan to beg relief from General Davis touches the heart of the American people as strongly as the appeal of the planters and merchants

who will assemble in mass meeting in the same city this afternoon to beg that whatever Congress proposes to do it will do quickly and end their suspense. When General Davis requested the mayor of San Juan to provide the afflicted women with conveyance back to their homes, he was met with the reply that there is not a penny in the treasury and that the police were still unpaid for their last two months' work. The position in which the United States is put in the eyes of the world through the influence that is exercised over the party in power by the greedy protected industries makes the cheek of every true American burn with shame.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is within the power of gentlemen upon that side of the Chamber, within twenty minutes, or within thirty minutes, at least, to pass a law which will make at once available over \$2,000,000 to be carried to the island which the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, declared two weeks ago was "storm-swept and starving." Will you do so, or will you rather continue the miseries of unjust taxation now being wrung from those people, delay this matter, and deny relief to them, in order that you may force through the bill which you passed in this House, denying to them the free trade which the President of the United States said "was our plain duty" to give to them, the passage of which caused many gentlemen upon that side of the Chamber to run home and hustle for their renominations?

I ask you, gentlemen, why play politics? Do not resort to the tactics of the person who imposed upon the press by giving out an interview, pretendingly coming from a member of the Cabinet of the President, accusing gentlemen who refused to vote for your measure, taxing both American and Puerto Rican products, of being "crafty politicians who were attempting to play upon the sympathies and prejudices of the country." I do not believe that any Cabinet officer was so lost to self-respect as to give out such an interview, or that any man was ever elevated to so high an office in this Government so unfitted for it as to have given out any such anonymous statement, reflecting upon the President, upon members of Congress, the press, and people of the United States, who believe in free trade with Puerto Rico.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it is the plain duty of this House, in view of the distressing conditions which exist in that unhappy island, to pass the bill as amended by the Senate. Conditions are far worse under the pretended "benevolent assimilation" that we are taking to them than it was under the tyrannical domination of Spain. As between the government that existed there at that time, when they had full proportional representation in the Spanish Cortes equal to that of any other Spanish territory, and the military government we maintain there, wringing taxes under the Dingley bill from them, coupled with the effort to lay an export upon our own breadstuffs shipped to a starving people, I denounce our treatment as far worse than the government which we overthrew when we drove the Spanish flag from that unhappy island.

In the debate that preceded the passage of this bill, after the Republican party had made the mistake of going back upon the recommendation of their President "to give free trade to Puerto Rico," the air was full of slanders upon the President, many pretending that he had officially declared to the people of the United States and recommended to the American Congress "that it was our plain duty to give free trade to Puerto Rico" while privately attempting to electioneer with individual members of this House to get them to vote against his recommendation. You made that fatal mistake, and two weeks afterwards, under the guise of pretended sympathy for these outraged people, you came in here with a flourish of trumpets and passed an appropriation bill for the relief of Puerto Rico, when the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] four days before, while advocating a tax upon exports to and imports from Puerto Rico, had declared:

We on this side have to construct; we have got to do something. This bill must pass or we must vote \$2,000,000 out of the Treasury for the coming year to care for Puerto Rico. We do not like to do that.

That tax bill passed. The appropriation bill also passed and is here. It carries, as amended by the Senate, over \$2,000,000 for the relief of Puerto Rico. It gives them that which you declared they were entitled to and in which the Senate of the United States agrees, and you have an opportunity without further debate, without waiting to see what will come as the result of your experimental legislation (passed as a predicate for a Supreme Court decision), to rise to the full measure of your duty and vote with the gentlemen upon this side of the House to concur in the Senate amendments, in order that the starving people of Puerto Rico may receive the relief to which they are entitled, and thereby recover, in a measure, from the anomalous position in which you have been placed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left to this side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used eleven minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for delaying the House long in the consideration of the motion

made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. The question raised by it is a simple one. The effect of his motion is to give to the uses of the government of Puerto Rico not only the \$2,000,000 appropriated by the bill, but in addition all revenue collected from the 1st of January up to the point of time when the existing tariff laws between Puerto Rico and the United States are supplanted by others. On the other hand, the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] would terminate the appropriation of these duties on the first day of January last.

The conflict between the two motions has nothing to do with free trade between the island and the United States. It has nothing to do with the formation of a civil government for the island of Puerto Rico. There are many men in this House and at the other end of the Capitol who are giving that question their daily attention. It can not be done in a day. The work can not be done in the interest of the inhabitants of Puerto Rico unless it be done carefully and intelligently. The prevailing of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois will not retard the formation of a civil government for Puerto Rico for a single hour. The success of the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas will not advance the formation of a civil government for that island a single instant. The success of either motion will not affect the question of free trade between the island and the United States. That may come in time. It probably will come in time. But until there is some action by Congress duties are collected at the ports of Puerto Rico and duties are collected at the ports of the United States upon the traffic between the two sections.

The proposition of the gentleman from Illinois is to declare a policy; to declare that until the law is changed, whether that be sooner or later, every dollar of taxation upon the traffic between Puerto Rico and the United States shall be devoted solely and exclusively to the benefit of the island. Can any gentleman find any fault with that upon this side of the House? Ought any gentleman on that side of the House to find any fault with it? It is simply the extension backward of the principle of the bill which has already passed the House. It is the declaration of the Congress of the United States that until legislation can be had upon that subject-matter no dollar of taxation which is collected upon the traffic between the island and the United States shall go to the benefit of the people of the United States, but that every dollar of it shall go exclusively to the benefit of the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. BALL. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BALL. Will not sending the bill to conference delay the relief of Puerto Rico?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Oh, it may delay it an hour, or a day, and it may delay it two days, but it will not delay it to any appreciable extent. Everybody understands that they are to have this money; they are to have the two millions in any event. According to the position of our side of the House, they not only will have the \$2,000,000 but every other dollar of taxation collected upon the traffic between the island and the United States under the existing law.

Mr. BALL. Is it not a fact that you were so pressed for time to give these people that relief that you declined to submit the original proposition to a committee to be considered, the haste was so great? Why not give them immediate relief by concurring in that for which the Senate of the United States has already voted?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I understand the gentleman to find some fault with the haste with which the bill was originally considered and passed in the House. I call his attention to the fact that the action taken at that time was taken by unanimous consent. If the measure should have gone to a committee, it was within the power of any gentleman on that side of the House, by his objection, to send it there.

Mr. BALL. I desire to make myself clear upon that matter. We did not object because we believed then that the necessity existed, and we believe it yet. That is why we did not object to the unanimous consent.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Well, so far we all agree that the necessity exists, and that the \$2,000,000 be devoted to the purposes of the island; and we say that in addition every dollar collected after the 1st of January, which stands exactly upon the same footing as the \$2,000,000 collected before the 1st of January, ought to be devoted to the same purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I yield the gentleman such further time as he may desire.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Speaker, there ought not to be any contention between the two sides of the House upon this proposition. Every gentleman ought to stand with us and give to the inhabitants of Puerto Rico every dollar of taxation which is collected upon the traffic between Puerto Rico and the United States until such time as Congress can act. Congress can

not act to-day; it can not act to-morrow. The action must be some time in the future. The House bill proposes to deal with the question once for all. We propose to be more generous with the island than you do. Why not come to us? Let us disagree about the Constitution, let us disagree about the expediency of giving free trade, but let us all agree that until that time comes every dollar of the money collected from duties between the two countries shall go back to the island of Puerto Rico, which is precisely the motion of the gentleman from Illinois. It ought to have the vote of every gentleman on both sides of the Chamber. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CANNON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY].

[Mr. McCLEARY addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. Speaker, few questions in this Congress have agitated the country like the proposition dealing with Puerto Rico. The issue has been made up before the country; the position of the two parties is distinctly understood. Now, as an excuse for the oppression that is to be directed against Puerto Rico, it is proposed to make it palatable by giving back to those people the money collected from them under the pretense that it is necessary for governmental purposes. The people of Puerto Rico ask no charity from Congress. They simply ask the privilege of sharing their part of the burden of taxation imposed by the Federal Government. They are willing to bear the same taxes that American citizens bear, and they want to share the same benefits. And if they enjoy the benefits of citizens of this Republic, they will cheerfully bear their part of the burden.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], when this infamous bill was introduced here which has received the reprobation of nearly the entire country, said the excuse for the outrage was a desire to raise revenue for the governmental purposes in Puerto Rico. I have here before me a petition sent to Congress—to the Ways and Means Committee of the House and to the Insular Committee of the Senate—signed by thousands of people in Puerto Rico, in which petition they show that they are willing to have the internal-revenue taxes of this Government extended to Puerto Rico.

In this estimate they show that they made last year 1,300,000 gallons of rum, which they are willing to have taxed \$1.10 per gallon, yielding a revenue of \$1,430,000. They made 250,000,000 cigarettes, which at \$1.50 a thousand would amount to \$375,000 in revenue. They made 120,000,000 cigars, which at \$3.60 would be \$432,000, making a total of \$2,237,000. Then the customs duties on goods coming from other countries to Puerto Rico, by simply extending the Dingley tariff there against foreign importations to the island, would amount to over \$200,000 a year, making a revenue from the simple extension of our customs and internal-revenue laws which, according to the figures of last year, would amount to \$2,452,000 a year, ample money—

Mr. McCLEARY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWANSON. I have not the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SWANSON. Ample money for governmental purposes. Now, these people are willing to bear the taxes, provided you impose upon them the same taxes that you impose upon your own citizens. They will bear that without complaint. They are willing to bear their part, and that will raise more than enough revenue to pay the expenses of running the government in Puerto Rico and will allow a surplus to go into the Treasury of the United States to help pay the Federal expenses, to support the Army and Navy, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWANSON. I refuse to yield. I have only five minutes. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the issue between these two parties on this question? The Democratic party takes the position that the Constitution of the United States—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas reserved six minutes, as the Chair understands.

Mr. McRAE. I give all my time to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. The Democratic party takes the position that the Constitution of the United States extends to Puerto Rico, and with it equal taxation: that whether it extends there or not, as a matter of justice, as a matter of right, as a matter of honest dealing, these people should have all the benefits of American citizenship and equal taxation with all other citizens.

No excuse can be given why this privilege should not be extended

to them, and yet we have Republican speakers and Republican leaders telling us that it is on account of expediency in the campaign of 1900 that they propose to ignore the right and justice that ought to be extended to 1,000,000 people in Puerto Rico.

What does that show, Mr. Speaker? It shows that at the commencement of our colonial policy the colonies are to be made the football of American politics; that a Republican campaign induces a great party to endeavor to deny right and justice to a starving people and to perpetrate an infamous wrong on them on account of a fear of some exigencies that may arise in the Presidential campaign.

What position do the Democratic party take? We say that Congress has the right to impose taxes in Puerto Rico, but the taxes imposed there ought to be precisely the same as are imposed in the United States.

What position do the Republican party take? They take the position that Congress has the right to determine the conditions on which Puerto Rican goods shall enter the United States, and thus fix the price, and the conditions on which American goods shall enter Puerto Rico, and thus fix the price. In other words, they claim the privilege of fixing the price at which Puerto Ricans shall sell their goods to us, and the price to which we shall sell our goods to them. That is precisely the same right claimed by Great Britain in 1776, and which was one of the chief causes of the American revolution. I say that that privilege of fixing the price at which you sell your goods to other people and the price at which you purchase theirs is a power that no just nation should want and a power that no nation has ever exercised without injustice and discrimination.

What do they tell us is the compromise which is proposed in the Senate now and advocated by a great many Republicans? The proposition, mark you, is that Puerto Rican goods shall pay a tax of 15 per cent to come in here, but that American goods shall go there free. That is the way that the thought of the majority of the Republican Senators is drifting to-day.

Why, gentlemen, if that is to be done, it is more iniquitous than the bill as it passed the House. To extend protection to American industries here and not to permit Puerto Rican industries to be protected, if there is anything in protection at all, is an act of power that is unjust, tyrannical, and iniquitous.

Now, this is a practical, concrete illustration of what imperialism means. We have read the speeches of gentlemen on the other side, glittering in their generalities, profuse in promises, but here is the first practical question that has come up before us in reference to the inauguration of an imperial policy, which means that Congress will be continually asked, by special interests here, to exploit the colonies for the benefit of a few special interests in the United States.

Now, when I spoke upon this question when it was before the House I showed an illustration of where it was sought to make the entire tobacco crop of Puerto Rico be brought here and manufactured into cigars, and to make it impossible to manufacture cigars in Puerto Rico and import them here in a manufactured state. How is that to be done? Let us see the gross injustice of this proposition.

The bill as it passed this House and as it is sustained to-day puts a tax of 15 per cent of the Dingley bill on tobacco imported in its raw state—about 6½ cents a pound for raw leaf tobacco. Now, take that same tobacco in Puerto Rico and make it into cigars and cigarettes and try to seek this market, and what is the duty a pound? It is one-sixth of \$4.50, which makes about 67½ cents a pound. What does that mean? It means that the cigar, cigarette, and cheroot factories of Puerto Rico must be closed and the 4,000,000 pounds of raw tobacco raised in Puerto Rico must be imported here in its raw state and made into cigars and cigarettes here. That is exactly the way Great Britain dealt with the colonies. They had discriminating duties, so as to prohibit and prevent any manufacturing development in the colonies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are 300 people to the square mile in Puerto Rico. These people can not develop nor live unless they are permitted to have manufacturing enterprises amongst them, such as we have in America. A great many of the cigars and cigarettes in Puerto Rico are manufactured in the homes of poor people. These people must be clothed. They have no market in the world to-day for these cigars and cigarettes except the United States of America. Now, the spirit behind the bill is the selfish concern of special interests which will be benefited by these discriminating duties. It is a desire to close up all the factories in Puerto Rico and to prevent the humble people who are making cigars and cigarettes from having employment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask the privilege of printing in connection with my remarks this petition sent to the Ways and Means Committee and to the Committee on Insular Affairs of the Senate, a petition signed by thousands of citizens of Puerto Rico. I ask to print it as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the petition referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The petition is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, merchants, manufacturers, bankers, agriculturists, and property owners, resident in Puerto Rico, beg to submit to your earnest consideration the following views as to the financial policy of Puerto Rico:

We note with regret the principle, enunciated by certain speakers in the lower House of Congress, that a tariff between Puerto Rico and the United States is the proper method of raising revenue for this island. To this we are unchangeably opposed, for the following reasons:

First. Because taxation on our exports means embargo on our foreign commerce.

Second. Because curtailment of our commerce with the United States locks up our products here and prevents us from gaining our legitimate proportion of profits on our productions. We can never become independent financially if forced to trade solely among ourselves; we must have a market other than Puerto Rico, or else we can not gain wealth. Do not mistake the proposed 15 per cent of Dingley rates for a reasonable rate. It is a fact that no class of goods produced here from leaf tobacco will be taxed less than 25 per cent ad valorem, while one of the most important of this class will be taxed 100 per cent ad valorem, under the bill adopted by the House of Representatives. If this is not embargo on our trade, what can it be called?

We earnestly ask for free trade, believing that with mutual interchange of products between the two countries the United States will be more than gainer. The United States will for many years supply our 1,000,000 people with their manufactured products in general.

We recognize the fact that a revenue to support the insular government would be necessary; but we are decidedly of opinion that the better method for raising that revenue will be by internal taxation, for the following reasons:

First. Because by that system no restriction will be placed on our commerce with the United States.

Second. Because the adoption of that system will be as simple in operation here as it is in the United States.

In considering the amount of revenue needed for this island, we beg to submit the following calculation, which, after due consideration, we believe can be realized.

There are annually produced in Puerto Rico the following:

1,300,000 gallons rum, which at \$1.10 per gallon.....	\$1,430,000
250,000,000 cigarettes, which at \$1.50 per thousand.....	375,000
120,000,000 cigars, which at \$3.00 per thousand.....	432,000

Estimate the entire special license tax as nominal at	2,237,000
	15,000

This will give us revenue total.....	2,252,000
One-third of that equals.....	750,666

A fair estimate of the annual cost of administration.....	600,000
Add for interest and sinking fund on bonds to be issued.....	150,000

Total required.....	750,000
---------------------	---------

Even with free trade with the United States there would be an additional revenue of at least \$2,000,000 annually from customs duties on goods coming here from foreign countries.

If Congress will authorize Puerto Rico to issue \$2,000,000 of forty-year 5 per cent bonds, the above provides for them, viz:

For interest.....	\$100,000
For sinking fund.....	50,000

Total.....	150,000
------------	---------

Therefore we infer that it will be unnecessary to adopt for this island the full internal-revenue rates of the United States. One-third of those rates will give ample receipts to cover all the above.

Puerto Rico has no bonded or other debts. Therefore, \$2,000,000 of bonds, to be issued for internal improvements, would be conservative.

We call your attention to the fact that it has been the custom for all countries to make internal improvements by the system of bonded indebtedness. That divides the expenses among succeeding generations. We do not desire to have the burden of internal improvements placed on us solely. If it must be so, then we ask that it be done by a system of internal taxation. That will not prevent the increase of our commerce with the States of the Union, nor will it starve us.

The fact can not be disputed that our people are in sore distress. All commerce is now hampered; investment of capital is stopped; farmers have not the means to plant or gather their crops; building and improving is impeded; capital refuses to come here for investment in either manufacturing or agricultural pursuits.

For the reason that the sovereignty of the United States over this island has deprived us of free trade with Spain and Cuba, which took our export at fair prices and enabled us to live, we now ask as a right, in equity, that free trade with the United States be given us.

We ask bread, as a right from our mother; do not, we pray, give us a stone. We ask for immediate decision.

Respectfully submitted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY].

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, the trouble with our friends upon the other side is that they talk one way and vote the other. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has just said that the Republican party was trying to oppress and refusing justice to these Puerto Ricans, refusing justice to a starving people. Now, what does he propose? To aid and feed the starving by extending the burdens of the internal-revenue laws of the United States to a people already destitute. Why, he says it would produce revenues for the Treasury of the United States, and he knows that every dollar of internal revenue collected down there would go into the Treasury of the United States and would not put a patch on a single Puerto Rican's pants. Upon the other hand, the Republican party comes and deals with it in a practical way. The Puerto Ricans can not realize upon the sympathy of the gentleman from Virginia or the Democratic party. They can only realize upon

cash. The Republican party proposes to give them cash by this bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I can not yield; I have only four minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was going to ask the gentleman—

Mr. HEMENWAY. The Republican party proposes to deal with this matter in a practical way. We do not offer the starving people free trade; we do not offer the starving people internal-revenue laws to tax them. We offer them dollars and cents with which to buy something to eat; we offer to them this bill, by which we not only propose to give them all the revenue taken in up to January 1, but propose to give them the revenues taken in from January 1 to the passage of this bill, and hereafter to give them every dollar that shall be taken in at this end of the line and the other end of the line, which shall be given to the Puerto Ricans to buy food and conduct their government. That is practical. We give them means with which to buy something; and the gentlemen upon the other side offer them free trade and additional taxation in the way of internal revenue.

Why, it is nonsense to talk about free trade helping the suffering. I say that free trade never helped anybody. It is money that will help the Puerto Ricans, and by giving them 15 per cent of the Dingley rates we will give them \$2,000,000. The United States does not want a cent of it and does not get a cent of it. We give every penny back to them for their use. Then we are not injuring the Puerto Ricans. Where are we taking a cent out of their pockets by the provisions of the bill which passed the House? Please answer. On the other hand, I think we are dealing with them liberally. We say to them, We give you 15 per cent of the Dingley rates, and give you every dollar which is taken in at that end of the line or this end of the line.

The crop that is already produced is now in the hands of the speculators, and we secure the revenue by the House bill; you get the benefit of it for Puerto Rico, and after that we propose to talk about free trade for you; and as a rule I believe every man on this side of the House is willing at that time that the Puerto Ricans shall have free trade with the United States. I want to ask the gentleman from Virginia, when you say that we are dealing with starvation, what is your remedy? You say, Tax them more by extending the internal-revenue laws to Puerto Rico. We say, Do not tax them any more, but give them the revenues that have been collected up to this time and hereafter to be collected; give it to them to buy food, for educational purposes, and the building of roads. That is our policy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I sometimes think words are cheap. After all, it is action that you want to inquire about. An act is something accomplished. Words may clothe an idea, if the man that uses words has an idea to clothe. [Laughter.] They may conceal an idea if he has it. To put it as it is put out West, "Talk is cheap." [Laughter.] Action, however, is material; when action is had and accomplished, it means an accomplishment in fact.

Now, let us test for a minute this motion that I made and the motion that the gentleman from Arkansas makes in the light of action. On the 2d day of March we voted on this bill which passed the House, and we appropriated every dollar that has been collected on imports from Puerto Rico, not since the treaty of peace, but since Puerto Rico was occupied by us, since the Spanish evacuated and we took possession, to the 1st of January. Aye, more; it appropriates every dollar that has been collected from the 1st of January to the enactment of this law. Aye, more; it appropriates every dollar that shall be collected under existing law upon imports from Puerto Rico. That is the House bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, then, when that bill was reported the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] and the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. BALL and Mr. BAILEY] and 108 men upon that side of the House voted nay on its passage. That was action; talk is cheap. Action speaks for itself. The bill passed. It went to the Senate; the Senate accepted the bill so far as the \$2,000,000 is concerned, but the Senate struck out that part of the bill which appropriates the money collected on those imports from Puerto Rico since the 1st of January.

It strikes out that portion of the bill that devotes the money that shall be collected to-morrow, next day, next week, next month, as long as those duties are collected upon the imports from Puerto Rico. Now, my motion is to nonconcur in that action of the Senate. If the bill is right for \$2,000,000 for the benefit of Puerto Rico, it is right for the balance, and the 108 men that voted against anything, \$2,000,000 and everything else, voiced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BALL], come in and indulge in language, language! [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BALL] has indulged in language, and what language it was! "Poor Puerto Ricans, oppressed by the United States. We have torn them from that magnificent and magnanimous government, Spain, that looked after them and fostered them." Oh, what a different song gentlemen sung two years ago on that side of the House. You would think now, to hear them talk, that Spain was the most kindly Government that ever controlled colonies on earth. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Gentlemen, talk is cheap. Here is action. The action of the House was right when we passed this bill. The action of the Senate is right as to the \$2,000,000 and is wrong as to the balance. Therefore, along the line of correct principle, with a proper respect to our own action, to cover the whole case of these revenues, and from now until the time that legislation is had by this Congress, let us nonconcur in these amendments and go to the Senate in conference and say that the House insists not only upon the \$2,000,000, but upon the balance of the money that has been collected or shall be collected under existing law; simply that and nothing more. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. McRAE. And on that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Upon that the gentleman from Arkansas demands the yeas and nays. All those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise in their places. Evidently a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 87, nays 113, answered "present" 18, not voting 132; as follows:

YEAS—87.		
Allen, Ky.	Dougherty,	Lloyd,
Ball,	Elliott,	McClellan,
Bankhead,	Finley,	McCulloch,
Barber,	Fleming,	McDowell,
Bell,	Foster,	McRae,
Benton,	Gilbert,	Maddox,
Brenner,	Glynn,	Meekison,
Brower,	Gordon,	Miers, Ind.
Brundidge,	Green, Pa.	Moon,
Burke, Tex.	Griggs,	Neville,
Burnett,	Hay,	Norton, S. C.
Caldwell,	Henry, Miss.	Otey,
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Tex.	Pierce, Tenn.
Clayton, Ala.	Jett,	Rhea, Ky.
Cooper, Tex.	Johnston,	Rhea, Va.
Cox,	Jones, Va.	Richardson,
Daly, N. J.	Kitchen,	Riordan,
Davenport, S. W.	Kleberg,	Robb,
Davis,	Kluttz,	Robertson, La.
De Armond,	Lanham,	Shafroth,
Denny,	Latimer,	Sheppard,
Dinsmore,	Little,	Sims,

NAYS—113.		
Aldrich,	Curtis,	Howell,
Alexander,	Cushman,	Hull,
Allen, Me.	Dahle, Wis.	Jenkins,
Babcock,	Dalzell,	Jones, Wash.
Bailey, Kans.	Davenport, S. A.	Joy,
Baker,	Davey,	Kerr,
Barham,	Davidson,	Lacey,
Bartholdt,	Dick,	Landis,
Bingham,	Dolliver,	Lane,
Boutell, Ill.	Dovener,	Lawrence,
Bowersock,	Eddy,	Littauer,
Brick,	Emerson,	Littlefield,
Bromwell,	Esch,	Long,
Brosius,	Fletcher,	Lorimer,
Brown,	Fordney,	Lybrand,
Brownlow,	Foss,	McCleary,
Burke, S. Dak.	Gardner, N. J.	McPherson,
Burkett,	Graff,	Mann,
Burton,	Greene, Mass.	Marsh,
Calderhead,	Hamilton,	Mercer,
Cannon,	Haugen,	Metcalf,
Capron,	Hawley,	Mondell,
Clarke, N. H.	Heatwole,	Moody, Mass.
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hedge,	Moody, Oreg.
Connell,	Hemenway,	Morris,
Cooper, Wis.	Henry, Conn.	Mudd,
Corliss,	Hepburn,	Needham,
Cousins,	Hill,	O'Grady,
Crumpacker,	Hoffecker,	Olmsted,

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—18.		
Barney,	Bull,	Griffith,
Bartlett,	Burleson,	Kahn,
Berry,	Cowherd,	Lamb,
Bishop,	Gardner, Mich.	Loud,
Breazale,	Gibson,	Meyer, La.

NOT VOTING—132.		
Acheson,	Boutelle, Me.	Catchings,
Adams,	Bradley,	Chanler,
Adamson,	Brantley,	Clayton, N. Y.
Allen, Miss.	Broussard,	Cochran, Mo.
Atwater,	Burleigh,	Cooney,
Bailey, Tex.	Butler,	Crawford,
Bellamy,	Campbell,	Cromer,
Boreing,	Carmack,	Crowley,

Faris,	Lentz,	Polk,	Southard,
Fitzgerald, Mass.	Lester,	Powers,	Spight,
Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Levy,	Quarles,	Stallings,
Fitzpatrick,	Lewis,	Ransdell,	Stewart, N. J.
Fowler,	Linney,	Reeder,	Stewart, N. Y.
Fox,	Livingston,	Ridgely,	Sulloway,
Freer,	Loudenslager,	Rixey,	Tate,
Gaines,	Lovering,	Roberts,	Taylor, Ohio
Gamble,	McAleer,	Robinson, Ind.	Taylor, Ala.
Gaston,	McCall,	Robinson, Nebr.	Terry,
Gayle,	McLain,	Rucker,	Thomas, Iowa
Gill,	Mahon,	Ruppert,	Thropp,
Gillet, N. Y.	May,	Ryan, N. Y.	Tompkins,
Gillet, Mass.	Mesick,	Ryan, Pa.	Tongue,
Graham,	Miller,	Salmon,	Underhill,
Grosvenor,	Minor,	Scudder,	Underwood,
Groat,	Morgan,	Shackleford,	Vreeland,
Grow,	Muller,	Shattuc,	Wanger,
Hall,	Naphen,	Sherman,	Waters,
Hitt,	Newlands,	Showalter,	Weaver,
Hopkins,	Noonan,	Sibley,	Weymouth,
Howard,	Norton, Ohio	Smith, Ill.	Wilson, S. C.
Jack,	Otjen,	Smith, H. C.	Wise,
Ketcham,	Packer, Pa.	Smith, Samuel W.	Young,
Knox,	Pearce, Mo.	Smith, Wm. Alden	Ziegler.

So the motion of Mr. McRAE to concur in the amendment of the Senate was rejected.

Mr. BURLESON. I desire to withdraw my vote, as I am paired with the gentleman from New York, Mr. DRISCOLL. If he were present, I should vote in the affirmative.

Mr. LAMB. I am paired with my colleague, Mr. WISE. I ask to withdraw my vote.

Mr. BULL. I am paired with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BAILEY. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I am paired with the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. DAYTON, and therefore desire to withdraw my vote.

Mr. BROWNLOW. I am paired with my colleague, Mr. CARMACK, and desire to withdraw my vote.

Mr. MADDOX. I am paired with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR. If he were present, I should vote "aye."

Mr. BARNEY. I am paired with the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. ALLEN. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MADDOX. I rise to a question of privilege. This morning General GROSVENOR asked me to pair with him on this bill. I agreed to do so. I now understand that he is paired with another member. If that is true, I demand the right to vote. I have been here, and answered "present" when my name was called. As I understand, I have a right to change my vote from "present" to "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GROUT). The gentleman has that privilege.

Mr. MADDOX. Let it be understood that I vote with the understanding that General GROSVENOR is paired with another member. Is that the understanding at the desk?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] is otherwise paired.

Mr. MADDOX. Then I vote "aye."

Mr. COWHERD. Is the name of Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania recorded?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He did not vote.

Mr. COWHERD. I had a pair with him until such time as he might return to-day. I voted "aye." I desire to withdraw my vote.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to know whether the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FOWLER, has voted on this proposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He is not recorded.

Mr. BARTLETT. Having voted "aye," and being paired with the gentleman from New Jersey, I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. BERRY. I desire to withdraw my vote, and ask to be recorded "present." I am paired with the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. POWERS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. My colleague, Mr. GAINES, is detained from the House by illness; and my other colleague, Mr. CARMACK, is absent on account of important business. If these gentlemen were present, they would vote "aye."

Mr. NEWLANDS. I had an impression I was paired with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HEMENWAY, but I understand now he has voted. I should therefore like the privilege of voting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recorded as being present.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the gentleman did not respond when his name was called, his request to vote can not be granted.

Mr. BABCOCK. It seems to me it would save time if the Clerk would announce the pairs.

The following pairs were announced:

For this session:

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania with Mr. POLK.
Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL.

Mr. LOUD with Mr. DE VRIES.
 Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON (except election cases).
 Until further notice:
 Mr. THOMAS of Iowa with Mr. SPIGHT.
 Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. GAYLE.
 Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine with Mr. CUSACK.
 Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. FOX.
 Mr. WISE with Mr. LAMB.
 Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BRANTLEY.
 Mr. GIBSON with Mr. TATE.
 Mr. MCCALL with Mr. GAINES.
 Mr. CROMER with Mr. GRIFFITH.
 Mr. BOREING with Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 Mr. WEYMOUTH with Mr. BROUSSARD.
 Mr. GROSVENOR with Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana.
 Mr. FOSS with Mr. CUMMINGS.
 Mr. PUGH with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.
 Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. STALLINGS.
 Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.
 Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. DRIGGS.
 Mr. BARNEY with Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi.
 Mr. HENRY C. SMITH with Mr. RANDELL.
 Mr. CRUMP with Mr. RYAN of New York.
 Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. CARMACK.
 Mr. REEDER with Mr. QUARLES.
 Mr. GAMBLE with Mr. NOONAN.
 Mr. BISHOP with Mr. LESTER.
 Mr. GILL with Mr. BELLAMY (except Pearson contest).
 Mr. SOUTHARD with Mr. NORTON of Ohio.
 Mr. GROW with Mr. CHANLER.
 Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. RUCKER, until April 5.
 Mr. GROUT with Mr. LIVINGSTON, until March 28.
 Mr. LINNEY with Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska, until March 26.
 Mr. FARIS with Mr. ZENOR, until March 26.
 Mr. BULL with Mr. BAILEY of Texas, until March 23.
 Mr. MAHON with Mr. BREAZEALE, until March 22.
 Mr. SULLOWAY with Mr. CATCHINGS, until March 22.
 Mr. LOVERING with Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts, until March 22.
 Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. ATWATER, until March 24.
 Mr. PEARCE of Missouri with Mr. CROWLEY, until March 24.
 Mr. POWERS with Mr. BERRY, until March 24.
 Mr. SHATTUC with Mr. SHACKLEFORD, until March 21.
 Mr. KAHN with Mr. RUPPERT, until March 21.
 Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. GASTON, until March 20.
 Mr. KNOX with Mr. NAPHEN, until March 20.
 Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. MULLER, until March 20.
 For this day:
 Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. BRADLEY.
 Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. MAY.
 Mr. MINOR with Mr. RIXEY.
 Mr. MESICK with Mr. TERRY.
 Mr. JACK with Mr. HOWARD.
 Mr. SHOWALTER with Mr. RIDGELY.
 Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BARTLETT.
 Mr. BUTLER with Mr. COWHERD.
 Mr. MORGAN with Mr. MCALDER.
 Mr. ADAMS with Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. WATERS with Mr. SALMON.
 Mr. VREELAND with Mr. ZIEGLER.
 Mr. TONGUE with Mr. CRAWFORD.
 Mr. MILLER with Mr. LEVY.
 Mr. FREER with Mr. FITZGERALD of New York.
 Mr. HITT with Mr. LEWIS.
 Mr. THROPP with Mr. CLAYTON of New York.
 Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.
 Mr. OTJEN with Mr. SCUDDER.
 Mr. YOUNG with Mr. LENTZ.
 Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. COONEY.
 Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts with Mr. NEWLANDS.
 Mr. STEWART of New Jersey with Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri.
 Mr. STEWART of New York with Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 Mr. WEAVER with Mr. McLAIN.
 Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. TERRY, is absent on account of sickness. If he were present, he would vote "aye."
 Mr. CUMMINGS. I was paired with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. FOSS, but I understand that he has voted, and I ask that my vote be recorded.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recorded as "present," and consequently his request can not be granted.
 Mr. CUMMINGS. I should have been present if I had not understood that I was paired.
 Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. ATWATER, and so I have voted "present."
 Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I notice that my name has been

announced as paired with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. HAMILTON. That pair was to expire last Saturday, so I voted. The gentleman from Michigan is here, and I am informed that he also has voted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The refusal of the house to concur is the same as an affirmative vote to nonconcur in the amendments of the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House ask a conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker pro tempore announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. CANNON, Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts, and Mr. McRAE.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HEMENWAY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 9711) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves all points of order.

DISTRICT BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This being the day set apart by special order for the business of the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of that committee [Mr. BABCOCK], is recognized.

WASHINGTON TELEPHONE COMPANY.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 9047) to incorporate the Washington Telephone Company and to permit it to install, maintain, and operate a telephone plant and exchanges in the District of Columbia.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Samuel Ross, Thomas W. Smith, Frank B. Noyes, Edgar P. Berry, and Richard A. Johnson, of the District of Columbia, and Henry A. Parr, Thomas J. Hayward, James Bond, George R. Webb, J. Bernard Scott, and Harry W. Webb, of the city of Baltimore, State of Maryland, their associates and successors be, and they are hereby, created a body corporate under the name of the Washington Telephone Company, and by that name shall have perpetual succession and shall be able to sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, defend and be defended in all the courts of law and equity within the United States, and may have and use a common seal.

SEC. 2. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to permit the Washington Telephone Company to install, maintain, and operate a telephone plant and exchanges, and the necessary service connected therewith, in the city of Washington and in the District of Columbia, under such rules, regulations, and restrictions as now are or may hereafter be made relating to telephone companies in the said city or District; and they shall permit said company to lay all necessary underground conduits and ducts in said city to carry its wires, and to string wires on poles in the alleys of said city and in the District of Columbia, subject to the same regulations and restrictions as now apply, or may hereafter be prescribed for telephone companies in the city of Washington and District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may require all conduits laid under the authority of this act to be laid under such conditions and regulations as they may prescribe; and they shall be so planned and constructed as to form a part of a general subway system which may hereafter be constructed and the plans for which the said Commissioners are authorized to prepare. Any corporation having underground ducts in the District of Columbia not in use may lease them to any other corporation or individual in said District required by law or desiring to put its wires underground.

SEC. 3. That the rates to be charged by the said Washington Telephone Company shall not exceed \$30 per year for the use of a telephone in a private residence, nor \$48 per year for the use of a telephone for business purposes in the city of Washington; that said company shall install and use telephones of a good quality and on metallic circuits only, in the city of Washington.

SEC. 4. That it shall be lawful for the Washington Telephone Company to acquire by purchase, rental, or otherwise, any conduit or conduits, duct or ducts, now laid or that may hereafter be laid in the city of Washington or in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. That said corporation shall file with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia within sixty days from the approval of this act its plans for a system of subways, conduits, and ducts, with necessary manholes, and shall have a telephone exchange, with not less than 1,500 telephones in actual operation, within fourteen months from the approval by said Commissioners of its system of subways, as above specified. All extensions and additions made to the said subways, conduits, and ducts shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Within fifteen days after said Washington Telephone Company has organized by the election of its officers, it shall enter into bond to the District of Columbia in the sum of \$100,000, with surety or sureties to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, conditioned upon the faithful performance of all the provisions and requirements of this act; and upon failure of said company to comply with said provisions and requirements, the said sum of \$100,000 shall be and become due and payable as liquidated damages, and upon the failure of said corporation to furnish said bond within the time herein specified the rights and franchises hereby granted shall cease and determine. The plans in this section required to be submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be acted upon by said Commissioners at the earliest practicable date after their submission, in order to enable said company to carry out speedily the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. That the said corporation is hereby authorized and empowered to acquire by purchase or lease such property, building, or buildings as shall be necessary for the successful operation of its telephone system and exchanges.

SEC. 7. That within fifteen days from the approval of this act the incorporators named herein, or a majority of them, shall meet in the city of Washington and notify the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in writing of the acceptance of this charter, and shall within fifteen days after said meeting open in said city its books for subscription to the capital stock of said company, of which notice shall be given both as to time and place in at least three papers published in the city of Washington. When the books of subscription to the capital stock of said company are closed, the incorporators herein named, or a majority of them, shall call a meeting of the stockholders, to be held in the city of Washington, of which public notice both as to time and place shall be given for three days in three newspapers published in the city of Washington, at which meeting a board of 11 directors shall be chosen and such other business be transacted as may be deemed proper. At all meetings of the stockholders each stockholder shall be entitled to one vote for each share of stock held by him, and he may vote in person or by proxy.

SEC. 8. That the government and direction of the affairs of said corporation shall be invested in a board of eleven directors, every member of which shall be a stockholder of record, and each shall hold his office for one year and until his successor is elected and qualified. Said directors, a majority of whom shall be a quorum, shall annually elect one of their number to be president of the company, and they shall also elect a vice-president, a secretary, and a treasurer, and such other officers as they may deem proper. In the case of a vacancy in the board of directors, the vacancy shall be filled by the remaining directors.

SEC. 9. That the stockholders shall have the power to make such by-laws as they deem expedient for the proper conduct of the business of the company, and shall prescribe the duties of its officers.

SEC. 10. That there shall be an annual meeting of the stockholders held in the District of Columbia, at which meeting said directors shall make a report in writing of the business of the previous year, and shall at such meeting choose from among their number directors for the ensuing year.

SEC. 11. That the capital stock of said company shall be \$500,000, and said company shall have power to issue bonds and secure the same by a mortgage of its entire property, rights, privileges, and franchises in an amount equal to the capital stock outstanding at any time.

SEC. 12. That there shall be reserved in the conduits constructed under the authority of this act one duct for the free use of the District of Columbia for the wires of its fire-alarm and police-patrol system.

SEC. 13. That if after the passage of this act the incorporators herein named shall sell the charter or franchise herein granted, all the rights and privileges herein given shall be forfeited.

SEC. 14. That should the property, rights, and franchises of the Washington Telephone Company be at any time hereafter acquired by any other corporation or person or persons, said corporation, person, or persons shall take said property, rights, and franchises subject to all the restrictions, liabilities, and penalties of this act; and by the acquisition of the property, rights, and franchises of the said Washington Telephone Company said purchasers shall thereby subject to the liabilities, penalties, and restrictions of this act any other telephone plant or properties then or hereafter owned or operated by said purchasers.

SEC. 15. That said company shall pay an annual tax equal to 1½ per cent of the gross receipts of said company in the District of Columbia in lieu of all tax on personal property.

SEC. 16. That the said Washington Telephone Company shall, on or before the 1st day of February in each year, make a report to each the Senate and the House of Representatives, which report shall be sworn to and signed by the president and treasurer of the said company, and shall cover the period of one year ending the 31st day of December previous to the date of making the report. Such report shall state the amount of capital stock, with a list of the stockholders and the amount of stock held by each; the amount of capital stock paid in; the total amount of funded debt; the amount of floating debt; the average rate per annum of interest on funded debt; the amount of dividends declared; cost of equipment, including land and buildings; cost of general superintendence, salaries of officers, clerks, and office expenses; water and other taxes; total expense of operating its plant; rent; payment for maintenance and repairs; payments for interest; payments for dividends on stock, amount and rate per cent, and total payments during the year; receipts from all sources, specifying what.

SEC. 17. That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

The following amendments, recommended by the Committee on the District of Columbia, were read:

In line 7, section 3, page 3, after the word "only," insert a comma.

In line 3, section 7, page 5, after the word "Washington," insert a comma and the following: "and each subscriber shall at the time of subscribing pay in cash 10 per cent of the amount subscribed by him; otherwise the subscription shall be null and void."

In line 11, section 11, page 6, strike out the word "five" and substitute the word "seven" therefor, and after the word "hundred," in said line, insert "and fifty," so as to read "\$750,000."

In line 23, section 16, page 7, strike out the word "now."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. MADDIX. I hope we will not pass this bill without some explanation. It seems to be of considerable importance.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say in reference to this bill that it represents the investigation and work that has been done by the District Committee during the past three years. It is the first tangible, reliable proposition on this subject that has ever been presented to the District Committee for its consideration and action.

I believe that the rights and interests of the people of the District are as carefully safeguarded in this bill as it is possible to have them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PEARRE], who made the report and who is entirely familiar with the provisions of the bill, and he will explain them to the House.

Mr. PEARRE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is necessary to add much to what has been so well said by the chairman of the District Committee, except perhaps to go in detail over the sections of this bill, to give a concise statement of the purpose of each section, and in that way to enable the members of the House to understand what the bill contains.

The first section of the bill, as the members of the House will observe, simply erects the corporation and designates the incor-

porators, giving the usual right to sue and be sued, and the other customary rights of corporations.

The second section gives the corporation power, under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to lay its conduits, the system of conduits being under the entire control and supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The third section of the bill fixes the rate to be charged, which rates are \$36 a year for residences and \$48 a year for business houses.

Mr. DENNY. Not to exceed that sum.

Mr. PEARRE. As my colleague from Baltimore has suggested, not to exceed that sum. It fixes the limit. In other words, the charge is not to exceed \$36 a year for residences and \$48 a year for business houses.

Mr. HEPBURN. The rates that you have fixed in this bill are the same, are they not, that the court of this city recently held to be beyond the power of Congress to fix, because it confiscated, as the court said, the property of the corporation?

Mr. PEARRE. Not exactly, if the gentleman will permit me to explain. Judge Barnard, of the United States district court, in his opinion in the case of Manning vs. The Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company, in which a bill was filed to prohibit the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company, the local telephone company here, from taking out a telephone because the company had refused to comply with the act of 1898 which limited the charges for telephones to \$50—Judge Barnard, in that opinion, said that \$72 a year was the amount needed to operate each single telephone in the District of Columbia, and that because that clause of the act of 1898 which fixes the limit at \$50 was less than what the company could operate its single telephones for, therefore, as far as that particular company was concerned, the operation of the act was practically a confiscation of its property, and therefore that the company was not bound by it, for the reason that that portion of the act was unconstitutional.

But, as the gentleman from Iowa can see, that would in no way affect this company, because a rate is fixed in the act which incorporates the company, and when the company accepts the act of incorporation of course it is estopped from making any such objection.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me further?

Mr. PEARRE. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. I suppose that the purpose of this bill is to secure cheap telephone service in this city?

Mr. PEARRE. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. A purpose that everyone would sympathize with. I would ask the gentleman if there is not a better method? Is there no power to compel the corporation which is now using the streets and enjoying this franchise to obey that act of Congress?

Mr. PEARRE. In reply to the gentleman from Iowa, I would say that that effort has been made, and was made in the act of 1898.

Mr. HEPBURN. And the corporation is now refusing to obey that act of Congress.

Mr. PEARRE. And an appeal, I believe, is pending from the decision of Judge Barnard.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would ask the gentleman if there is not a remedy for that conduct on the part of the company by refusing it longer the use of the streets of Washington for the purpose of carrying on its business?

Mr. PEARRE. Not if the judgment of Judge Barnard in that case, determining the act of 1898 to be unconstitutional, is upheld. There would be no relief except the incorporation of a competing company. I will add, if the gentleman will permit me, in this connection, in further answer to his question, that the history of telephone controversies, or of the effort to secure lower telephone charges throughout the United States, has been that the rates have never been lowered except by the incorporation of competing companies and the allowance of the erection of plants by those companies.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does the gentleman mean to say that this company is so intrenched here in the city of Washington, that it has such a hold upon these franchises, that there is no way of taking them away? Can we not repeal the act under which they are operating and take away the authority that has been given them?

Mr. PEARRE. My answer to that question is this: That there is no act under which they were incorporated. It is a New York company, which came here and got some privileges from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and those privileges have now become vested rights, and I know of no method under the law by which this company can now be deprived of those rights by any act of Congress.

An effort was made by the amendment of the act of June 30, 1898, which was the District of Columbia appropriation bill, in which this limitation of telephone charges was introduced. That matter has gone to the courts, and Judge Barnard, of the district court, has determined it is unconstitutional, because it confiscated

the property, and nothing except a reversal of that judgment by the Supreme Court would give the relief which the gentleman from Iowa suggests.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then I understand the gentleman to say that it is possible for the Commissioners of the District, without specific authority, to so invest this corporation with rights that the Congress of the United States can not take them away. Do you take that position?

Mr. PEARRE. I take the position that when rights have become vested neither the Congress of the United States nor any other legislative body can take them away.

Mr. HEPBURN. Have they become vested?

Mr. PEARRE. They have become vested.

Mr. BARNEY. How?

Mr. LATIMER. Suppose we destroy that company?

Mr. PEARRE. I would like the gentleman to answer that question and give the House his view upon that subject.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have no hesitation in answering it. I say that the Commissioners have no authority to vest any corporation with the right here to use a franchise that this Congress can not take away. We can do it in a day and bring this company to terms instantly.

Mr. PEARRE. I quite agree that the Commissioners perhaps had no right and should not have exercised that right. That is a matter into which the committee has not specially gone. The condition that the committee finds is that there is a general complaint on the part of the business men and residential owners of high telephone charges, and the committee have sought what appears to be the most practical and easiest and quickest method of correcting the difficulty which the gentleman says he desires to see corrected.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him this question? Have you any doubt if the Congress of the United States by an enactment should refuse permission to that company longer to use the streets that they would not come in here instantly to us asking to be reinstated in their rights under such terms as you would be willing to grant them? Do you doubt it?

Mr. PEARRE. I doubt that absolutely.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not.

Mr. PEARRE. Following their past history and past course, they would immediately appeal to the courts and take their case through to the Supreme Court of the United States, and would not come to the District Committee or to any other committee of this House. That is my opinion.

Mr. HEPBURN. I had thought that under the Granger cases, long ago decided, the Supreme Court harmed very seriously this old idea of vested rights upon the part of a corporation. I do not believe any such thing exists.

Mr. WACHTER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to his colleague?

Mr. PEARRE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WACHTER. Section 3 states the price for the use of these telephones. Are we to understand that each telephone is to have an individual wire or are there to be 6, 8, or 12 telephones upon one wire?

Mr. PEARRE. In answer to the gentleman's question, I will say that that section of this bill is identical with the bill originally introduced by the gentleman from Maryland who has put the question; and, therefore, perhaps he is better able to answer that question than any other gentleman in the House.

Mr. WACHTER. I desire to say here that I did not prosecute the investigation along that line. I thought probably that as the chairman of the District Committee said the gentleman was thoroughly familiar with the bill, that I could obtain the information I desired from my colleague.

Mr. PEARRE. It is perhaps fair to assume that a gentleman who introduces a bill is familiar with its provisions, and you must know that section 3 simply provides for the limit of telephone charges—namely, from \$36 to \$48. As the gentleman who asked the question can perhaps see by merely reading the provision, it does not require and does not specify the number of wires to be strung. He introduced the original bill and ought to know what this provision, which it contained, means.

Mr. WACHTER. But there is where the snake is. Now, if each telephone is to have an individual wire it strikes me it would be very reasonable to have \$48, but they may perhaps have 6, 8, 12, or 20 telephones on one wire, thereby saving expense. I would rather have the matter a little more explicitly set forth.

Mr. PEARRE. The gentleman may prepare such an amendment as he designates. I will not suggest for a moment that my very distinguished colleague from Maryland would think of introducing a bill into this House that contained a snake. If there be a snake, he introduced it.

Mr. WACHTER. I ask the gentleman's pardon. I made a mistake.

Mr. MANN. In regard to section 2, which provides for constructing the conduits and putting in the underground works and wires, I would like to ask the gentleman how far it will be necessary to construct an entirely new telephone system, if this bill is passed, and how far this company can use any conduits already constructed?

Mr. PEARRE. If the gentleman will look at section 4, he will see that that has been provided for.

Mr. MANN. I have read section 4. I ask you how far it would actually be necessary?

Mr. PEARRE. If the gentleman will not lose his temper—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will not lose his temper.

Mr. PEARRE (continuing). I would be glad to reply. Section 4 provides as follows:

That it shall be lawful for the Washington Telephone Company to acquire by purchase, rental, or otherwise, any conduit or conduits, duct or ducts, now laid or that may hereafter be laid in the city of Washington or in the District of Columbia.

Now, of course that does not require anybody to sell to this company. This company must take its chances, like any other company, in an effort to secure such conduits as now exist, and if it be impossible to secure the privilege by purchase of the use of conduits now existing it will be compelled to build a system of its own.

Mr. MANN. I had read section 4 before I asked the first question. I would like to ask the gentleman now whether he can give the House the information on the subject of how much the company could rent if it wanted to rent?

Mr. PEARRE. I have answered that; this company will have to take its chances with any other company as to being able to rent conduits. The committee is not informed as to the amount of conduits which this company will be able to secure. The committee has no assurance upon that line.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman if he knows how much there is in the city which any company could possibly rent, that is available for renting purposes? What I want to get at is to know whether this company, if it be incorporated and commenced to operate—whether it will be necessary to tear up the asphalt streets of Washington in order to construct a whole new system.

Mr. PEARRE. If it could secure the privilege of using the conduits of the telephone company that now exists in the District, it would not be necessary to tear up the streets. If it could not—and it is not likely that it could—then perhaps it would be necessary to tear up the streets.

Mr. MANN. I take it from the gentleman's answer that unless this company could obtain the use of the present telephone conduits, which is absolutely out of the question, it would be necessary, in order to install this new company, to tear up the streets of Washington.

Mr. PEARRE. I may say that there are other conduits; the street railroad companies have conduits.

Mr. MANN. That is the very information I am trying to obtain.

Mr. PEARRE. I am not able to give the number of miles owned by the street railways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fifth section, to which I am coming, fixes the limit of time in which this company must install itself and put into operation 1,500 telephones in the city of Washington, and the limit fixed is fourteen months. That is the provision of section 5. It will be observed that all extensions of conduits or subways are to be made under the control and supervision of the Commissioners of the District.

Section 5 in addition contains this very valuable safeguard, one which I do not know to have been incorporated in any bill of like character passed by Congress. Members of the House will observe that a bond of \$100,000 is required from the company, with sureties to be approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, conditioned upon the faithful performance of all the requirements of this act; and upon failure of said company to comply with said provisions and requirements, the said sum of \$100,000 shall be and become due and payable as liquidated damages.

I may say that that provision was incorporated in the bill by the committee, and that the bill as originally introduced by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WACHTER] contained very few safeguards of the rights of the people of Washington City and the District of Columbia. It was the earnest effort of the committee, after exhaustive hearings and constant consultations among its own members, to embody in this bill all the guaranties, securities, and sanctions of law which would protect the rights of subscribers to telephones.

Section 7 provides for the opening of the stock books. It is a formal section, but there is one feature of this to which perhaps the attention of the House ought to be called, and that is that 10 per cent of this stock must be paid upon subscription in cash or the subscription shall be null and void.

Sections 9 and 10, it will be observed, are merely formal. The

eleventh section fixes the capital stock at \$750,000, and the twelfth section reserves a duct or the free use of a duct or conduit in any system of ducts or conduits which this company may construct for the police department and the fire department of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HEPBURN. In the last section you require the company to report to Congress that portion of stock which is not fully paid up, and it is contemplated that only 10 per cent of the stock shall have been paid in. Would it not be proper to provide that the bonded indebtedness shall not exceed the amount of the outstanding stock fully paid up?

Mr. PEARRE. I see no objection, so far as the report is concerned, to amending the last, or sixteenth, section of the bill to meet the views of the gentleman.

Mr. HEPBURN. Would it not be well to put such a provision in the eleventh section?

Mr. PEARRE. I should say in reply to the gentleman that I do not think that would be a wise provision. There must be, as a matter of course, some latitude, some elasticity allowed to a company undertaking in the face of such opposition as will meet this company to construct a new telephone line. There must be some latitude allowed this company for the fight it will have to make in the efforts to finance this concern and get it into proper operation.

Mr. HEPBURN. How do you propose to finance it—with the capital stock or with the bonds?

Mr. PEARRE. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I do not propose to finance it at all; but I will add that, as the gentleman perhaps knows—because doubtless he is very much more familiar with the incorporation and perhaps the organization and financing of such companies than I am—the custom is to issue bonds to the amount of the capital stock. I believe that is the practice.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman kindly explain to me and to this House who are back of this bill? There are a few names mentioned here, but it does not appear whether there is an organization now ready for incorporation or whether stock is to be so placed that the public can subscribe for it. It seems to me that if this is to be a competing line and not to be controlled by existing companies, the stock of this company should be offered for subscription by the public, so that the new organization may be controlled by the public in this city.

Mr. PEARRE. What was the gentleman's question? I understood his statement.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I want to know who is back of this bill, who is asking for this incorporation, and what they have already done?

Mr. PEARRE. If the gentleman will permit me, I will answer his question. The people back of this bill are the people named in it as incorporators—Samuel Ross, Thomas W. Smith, Frank B. Noyes, Edgar P. Berry, and Richard A. Johnson, of the District of Columbia. All these gentlemen, as the committee is informed, are substantial business men of the District, and well known perhaps to most of the members of this House either personally or by reputation.

Mr. BABCOCK. And they are men of means.

Mr. PEARRE. As the chairman of our committee suggests, they are men of financial standing—men of means. In addition to these incorporators residing in the District of Columbia, the bill names the following gentlemen of the city of Baltimore: Henry A. Parr, Thomas J. Hayward, James Bond, George R. Webb, J. Bernard Scott, and Harry W. Webb. These are all men, I believe, of like financial character and standing.

Now, with regard to the opening of stock books, the gentleman from Pennsylvania will discover in section 7 this provision:

That within fifteen days from the approval of this act the incorporators named herein, or a majority of them, shall meet in the city of Washington and notify the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in writing of the acceptance of this charter, and shall within fifteen days after said meeting open in said city its books for subscription to the capital stock of said company, of which notice shall be given both as to time and place in at least three papers published in the city of Washington.

I do not see how any provision could be framed which would notify the public more fully and satisfactorily that books of subscription were opened.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. There is no provision made to have those books kept open. They can be closed in half an hour by a few men taking all this stock, and that probably is what is back of this bill. I believe if you are going to make this a competing line, if you are going to do the people of Washington any good by incorporating this new company, you should take means for getting this stock into the hands of the people generally, not a few people who will monopolize it. Besides, you should incorporate in the bill a provision for minority representation.

Mr. PEARRE. I yielded for a question, but have allowed the gentleman to make a statement which is very easily replied to, it seems to me. It can not make much difference to telephone sub-

scribers in the city of Washington, who desire, and are to get, under this bill, cheaper rates, whether Jones or Brown or Smith is a subscriber to the stock, provided the subscribers are responsible parties and provided the charter given by Congress contains proper provision for the protection of the people.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is there any provision as to the rates to be charged?

Mr. PEARRE. Oh, yes; \$36 and \$48 a year.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The bill guarantees cheaper rates?

Mr. PEARRE. The charges are not to exceed \$36 and \$48.

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to ask a question. If I want a telephone line connecting with my apartments, shall I be able to secure it from this company for \$36 a year and have no other persons using that line? Is that true?

Mr. PEARRE. I do not understand that the bill absolutely requires that. I do not so read it.

Mr. LANDIS. If the bill does not contemplate that, I suggest to the gentleman that it be so amended that it shall do so.

Mr. PEARRE. I am quite sure that the committee will be very ready to consider any amendment the gentleman may desire to submit.

Mr. LANDIS. It is a very material matter to a man wanting telephone privileges whether he is the only man on a given line, or whether there are ten or twelve others.

Mr. COWHERD. I have prepared an amendment in the line of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], which I think will be offered as a committee amendment.

Mr. PEARRE. As I have said, we shall be very glad to hear from the gentleman from Indiana if he wants to introduce an amendment of that sort. I will add in that connection that no telephone bill can be prepared—

Mr. LANDIS. Let me ask another question. If the rates named in the bill are not the maximum rates for a man wanting individual service, how much money will a man who wants private telephone service have to pay in order to get it?

Mr. PEARRE. Under this bill, as the gentleman will observe, this company can not charge more than \$36 or \$48 a year; they may charge him less, but can not charge him more for any kind of service, and, as the gentleman will further observe, the bill provides that he shall have a metallic circuit; nothing but a metallic circuit shall be used.

Mr. LANDIS. Will you consent to an amendment providing that single telephones on single wires shall be secured for \$36?

Mr. PEARRE. My colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD], has just suggested to the gentleman from Indiana that he has prepared a committee amendment which will perhaps meet the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. LANDIS. I should like to have it read.

Mr. PEARRE. The gentleman might consult with the gentleman from Missouri and see whether the amendment is satisfactory, whether it meets his views, and also the views of my colleague from Baltimore [Mr. WACHTER]. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will proceed.

Under section 13 of this bill, if the incorporators undertake to sell the franchises granted by this act of Congress they forfeit their franchise. Further than that, there is an additional section—

Mr. HEPBURN. Suppose the stock should be absorbed without any formal sale of the franchise. What would be the condition then?

Mr. PEARRE. I think the gentleman will discover that that is perhaps covered by section 14.

Mr. HEPBURN. It would not avoid this act, would it?

Mr. PEARRE. Has the gentleman carefully looked at section 14?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, I have looked over that.

Mr. PEARRE. In my judgment, that would be covered by section 14. It provides that—

should the property, rights, and franchises of the Washington Telephone Company be at any time hereafter acquired by any other corporation or person or persons, said corporation, person, or persons shall take said property, rights, and franchises subject to all the restrictions, liabilities, and penalties of this act.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PEARRE. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. Do you consider that a majority of the outstanding shares issued by this corporation would be a part of its property, rights, and franchises?

Mr. PEARRE. Yes; but it would not, of course, constitute a separate corporation.

Mr. OLMSTED. Then, if the other corporation, the rival corporation, should purchase a majority of the stock of this corporation, such purchase would not be in violation of the provisions of section 14.

Mr. PEARRE. I think beyond question it would. If it shall be acquired by any other corporation, person, or persons, said corporation, person, or persons shall take said property rights and

franchises, subject to all the restrictions and penalties of this act. And furthermore—

by the acquisition of the property, rights, and franchises of the said Washington Telephone Company said purchasers shall thereby subject to the liabilities, penalties, and restrictions of this act any other telephone plant or properties then or hereafter owned or operated by said purchasers.

Mr. OLMSTED. Yes; but you do not quite understand me. The stock of this company—the shares of its capital stock cease to be the property of the corporation itself, and therefore they are not within the language here “property, rights, and franchises.” They are the property of the stockholders, who can sell them to whomsoever they please.

Mr. PEARRE. I quite understand that, but I will say to the gentleman that I would challenge any gentleman to show any incorporation bill passed in any State of the Union or ever passed by Congress which imposed upon any company such a provision as section 14 imposes upon this company. I am frank to say that I have never seen any such conditions imposed upon any other company.

Mr. MUDD. May I suggest to my colleague, in aid of what he has said, that if a majority of the stock of this corporation should be acquired by any other company, that would not be another corporation, but it would still be subject to the restrictions of this act.

Mr. PEARRE. Absolutely.

Mr. OLMSTED. Suppose a bank acquired the stock. Would that bank become this corporation?

Mr. PEARRE. The closing clause of that section imposes another condition, which I have read. It not only imposes the restrictions of this bill upon the party who purchases, as far as the property purchased is concerned, but imposes the liabilities of this act and all its penalties upon any other property of the purchasing company then owned by it.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PEARRE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman conceive that under section 14, if the stockholders of the existing telephone company should become the stockholders of this company, that that would extend this act over the old company?

Mr. PEARRE. No; I do not contend that it would do anything of the sort.

Mr. MANN. Is not that the customary way of transacting stock business?

Mr. PEARRE. I have never known any company to have any such penalty imposed upon it as is imposed here.

Mr. MANN. Of course, I fail to see any penalty at all for the action which I have suggested.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. PEARRE. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman kindly inform me as to whether there are any provisions in this bill fixing the number of shares of stock and the price per share?

Mr. PEARRE. No, there is not.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Is not that usually put in, and should not that be put into a bill of this kind?

Mr. PEARRE. I do not see any necessity for it. The amount of the capital stock is limited, and that is the material matter.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Do not you think if this is to be a charter that that provision should be contained in it?

Mr. PEARRE. I see no objection to it.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Certainly a few men are not to gobble up the rights and privileges granted by this bill.

Mr. PEARRE. I see no objection to what the gentleman suggests; and if he desires to prescribe the number of shares and the par value I do not know that the committee would have any objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. The reason is very apparent. The other telephone company can buy up this charter at once. I do not know, but perhaps that may be the reason that they are coming here to be incorporated, because they are not incorporated at present.

Mr. PEARRE. I am glad to see the gentleman's solicitude for the telephone subscribers. I yielded to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. PEARRE. Yes.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the gentleman if there is any provision in the bill providing how the capital stock shall be paid in—what part in cash?

Mr. PEARRE. There is a provision in section 7.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. What does it provide?

Mr. PEARRE. That 10 per cent of the capital stock shall be paid in in cash, or the subscription shall be void.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. How is the rest of the capital stock to be paid in?

Mr. PEARRE. There is no provision in the bill as to the method to be pursued, other than that.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Then stock up to the limit of the authorized capitalization may be issued without any actual equivalent of value.

Mr. PEARRE. I understand that is the case above 10 per cent.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Then that opens all the doors to stock watering, which ought to be closed.

Mr. PEARRE. I will say to the gentleman that the company with which this company will be thrown into competition, when it comes to the question of stock watering (which company I believe has its home offices in Boston), has something like \$800,000 of watered stock, as is estimated, in its Washington branch.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That shows that we ought not to repeat the process here.

Mr. PEARRE. I have explained, in response to questions which have been asked, that that matter was left open for the purpose of allowing this company some latitude in the financing of its business. It is not unusual, but is quite usual. The House will also observe—

Mr. LANDIS. I should like to ask the gentleman another question. Is there anything in this bill that will permit or authorize the telephone company to limit the number of calls per day or per year that subscribers shall be entitled to?

Mr. PEARRE. I think there is nothing of that sort in the bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. It is unlimited.

Mr. LANDIS. The number of calls by subscribers are unlimited in the District of Columbia, and we make no regulations along that line.

Mr. PEARRE. Section 15, Mr. Speaker, provides a tax upon the gross receipts of 1½ per cent, and section 16 provides the method of reporting which has become usual in charters of this sort. Section 17 contains a provision which, while very short, is very important, and that is that Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, and repeal this act, a right which they do not seem to have at present with regard to any other telephone company which operates in the District of Columbia.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PEARRE. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. What rate of taxation does the present telephone company pay?

Mr. PEARRE. About \$300 a year. That is the information that the committee has.

Mr. TAWNEY. And this proposes to tax them 1½ per cent of the gross receipts. What would that amount to?

Mr. PEARRE. It is estimated it would amount to something like \$3,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. In most of the States the independent companies pay 3 per cent of the gross receipts. The Bell Company pays nothing.

Mr. PEARRE. The Bell Company here, as the committee is informed, pays \$300 a year, and has been paying \$300 only since it came here.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question in connection with that?

Mr. PEARRE. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I am not very familiar with matters pertaining to this District. This section provides that they shall pay a tax of 1½ per cent in lieu of all other taxes. Is there any franchise tax or any other tax in the District?

Mr. PEARRE. There is a tax on real estate levied, but this is in lieu of all taxes on personality. There is no franchise tax.

Mr. MANN. There is no real-estate tax levied upon the conduits or anything of that kind?

Mr. PEARRE. Nothing that I know of. It is generally a tax of 1½ per cent on the gross receipts. I will say, in answer to the question, that I have simply risen to explain as clearly as I could the principles of the bill, as well as some of the interests that urge its passage, and to answer questions and inquiries made by gentlemen of the House concerning the measure. The measure is presented by the committee in the interest of the subscribers of the city of Washington and to secure for them the use of the telephone, which has become a business necessity and a home comfort, at something like a reasonable rate. The committee has gone over this matter carefully, in a painstaking way, and conscientiously, and this bill is the result of that effort. I believe that it will result in great good to the people of the District of Columbia.

Gentlemen of the House will observe from the report that this bill has the unanimous indorsement of almost all the business organizations of the city. It is sustained by the indorsement of the Telephone Subscribers' Association, of about 500 members, the prominent business men of the city of Washington; it is indorsed by the Brightwood Avenue Citizens' Association; it is indorsed by the Georgetown Citizens' Association; it is indorsed by the

Columbia Heights Citizens' Association; it is indorsed by the Business Men's Association of Washington, of 800, and also, as I said, by the Telephone Subscribers' Association, of 500 people, which was organized not for the purpose of advancing the interest of any corporation or any company, but to secure, and with an eye single to securing, to the people of this city something like a reasonable telephone charge. This bill is the result of the committee's best effort on the subject, and the committee believes that the bill should pass.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from Wisconsin to the condition of things that I find by a hasty reading of this bill. In section 11 the issuing of \$750,000 in capital stock is authorized by the company, with an equal amount of mortgage bonds, making a total capitalization of \$1,500,000. Now, in section 7 there is a provision that the subscriber shall pay in only 10 per cent of the amount of his subscription. What is there to prevent the issue of a million and a half of stock and bonds with only a small amount in cash being invested? It seems to me that leaves open a great gateway for the watering of stock, upon which hereafter the people of the District of Columbia will be called upon to pay dividends.

Mr. PEARRE. I will say in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts that that condition of affairs has existed in this District since 1883, and a very much worse condition of affairs—

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It has existed all over the country.

Mr. PEARRE (continuing). And yet I do not know that the gentleman's voice was ever raised in protest against it. If the gentleman will examine into the condition of the affairs of the company against which this company will have to compete, he will discover that it bought out a little company in Washington City whose capital stock was \$100,000, and issued upon that, without any authority, so far as anybody knew, except the charter which it had from the State of New York, \$750,000 worth of stock and \$500,000 of bonds, and yet of that \$750,000 there was only a little over \$77,000 paid in cash.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman criticize that?

Mr. PEARRE. Criticise? Yes; I criticise it.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Then let us not do it again.

Mr. PEARRE. I criticise it to this extent, that perhaps it may effect in this case the ingenuosness of the objection which the gentleman from Massachusetts has made to the present bill.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, just a word in reply to the gentleman from Maryland. I just want to say to him that he is mistaken about my voice remaining silent upon this question. Ever since I have been in Congress, whenever the incorporation of any company has come before this House, I have raised my voice against any provision which would look to stock watering or any provision which would look to the issuing of stocks or bonds without exacting full payment for them. When this bill is read, I give notice that I shall offer an amendment that none of the stock or bonds shall be issued except in return for cash equal to the amount of the stock and bonds issued. That is the only safe way in which we can deal with these corporations. We are suffering from stock watering all over the country, and now, with the experience of the past, we know how to guard against these evils. I am not going to be a party to the passage of any bill which leaves open such an opportunity for stock watering as this bill does.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I have finished my remarks.

Mr. SIMS. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not know that if his amendment is adopted, it will absolutely prevent any organization of an opposing company here and effectually kill it?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. No; I do not want to do that, but I want to safeguard the bill.

Mr. SIMS. Well, we are trying to safeguard the people.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. BABCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I fully sympathize with the purposes of this bill, which is to secure reasonable telephone tolls in the city of Washington. If I believed that could be accomplished through this bill, I would readily support it, if that were the best method, but I do not believe it is the best method. I do not agree with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PEARRE] when he says that this Congress has no power over the corporation that for the last fifteen years or more has been robbing the people of this city through their exorbitant and excessive telephone tolls. I have no doubt whatever but that we have the power to stop that outrage. It is true that a court—I suppose it must be called a court—in the face of the experience of the people of this country in thousands of towns, has held that the rate of \$72 for the ordinary household service is not an excessive and extravagant one.

But we have the power to take away from that corporation its right to do business in this city. If they were made to believe that the Congress would do that, I have no hesitation in saying that instantly they would come to the terms that Congress laid down in the bill of two years ago.

I know something of the difficulties that the people in this city and Congress have had in their attempt to control the corporations in this city. I remember that for five years this Metropolitan Railway Company, in the face of an act of Congress, specific and plain, utterly refused obedience to the demands of that act. They were never brought to terms until this House, this body, repealed, so far as it could, the charter under which they were doing business. They then discovered that the Congress would not longer be tampered with; that it meant to compel obedience; and the splendid system we now have is the result of that kind of earnest legislation.

If this committee would take hold of this matter in that way and give this House an opportunity to vote upon such a proposition, I have no doubt that their efforts would be seconded by so hearty a majority that these gentlemen who are now contumacious would be here asking for terms.

Mr. PEARRE. If that result can be attained by this bill, will not that satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. HEPBURN. That result can not be attained by this bill. You can not have proper service in a city like this by installing two plants owned by separate companies. Here is one company with 2,200 or 2,300 telephones. This one you propose to have 1,500 telephones. Neither will serve the interests of the people—

Mr. BABCOCK. One thousand five hundred 'phones in fourteen months.

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). Without they are subscribers to both, and instead of alleviating the difficulty you simply double the burden. I do not believe it is wisdom, especially when we have the power to compel obedience, for upon that I have not the shadow of a doubt.

Mr. BABCOCK. Will the gentleman permit me a moment?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. BABCOCK. No one is more familiar with the conditions than is the gentleman from Iowa himself, and I will ask him the question: For the past eight years has not Congress in every way endeavored to compel a reasonable telephone rate in the city? Have not such attempts been made time and time again in this House, resulting with no success?

Mr. HEPBURN. I think the gentleman is correct; but you have never gone to the extreme I would suggest. You have advised, and nothing more than that, until two years ago, in the amendment that has been referred to, you had positive legislation. You have never attempted to repeal their rights. Apparently the committee has been under the influence of such gentlemen as the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BABCOCK. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the last night of the last session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, when I stood on the floor all night long and endeavored to prevent Congress passing an act which gave to all corporations in the city of Washington the right to extend their conduits anywhere they pleased. Congress did pass the act in spite of all that I could do, and that is the condition which exists to-day.

Mr. COWHERD. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. COWHERD. As matter of law, the present telephone company has no franchise from this Congress.

Mr. HEPBURN. It has the use of the streets of the city of Washington. Can not we stop them? Have we no police force?

Mr. COWHERD. If the courts have held, as they have held, that we can not fix the rate at \$50 because it is impairing the obligation of contracts, if that principle is right, is it not all the stronger that we can not take away the franchise that we have heretofore given them?

Mr. HEPBURN. Why, the gentleman says they are here without a franchise.

Mr. COWHERD. We can not take away the right under which they are operating.

Mr. HEPBURN. Has not Congress control over the streets? Can we not prevent a corporation from using those streets—from tearing them up in their attempts at repairs or construction? Why, sir, it seems to me it is nonsense to take a position like that. Could a railroad company locate its tracks through the streets here—appropriate them to its own purposes—without the consent of Congress? If they did, could we not direct the police power of the city to remove them? There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BABCOCK. Let me say to the gentleman that about a year ago Congress gave up all the rights it had in the streets of Washington and vested them in the Commissioners.

Mr. HEPBURN. No Congress can give up its rights in such a way that another Congress can not resume them.

Mr. COWHERD. The gentleman has not understood my

proposition, which was this: That if we could take away those rights absolutely, we could certainly regulate them by fixing a rate. The greater includes the less.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know that that follows at all. We may silently permit them to do a business, and then if they make contracts we must observe those contracts, or at least we must not destroy them. That is an entirely different proposition from that of usurping a right to the streets—appropriating to their own specific and peculiar purposes what belongs to all. There is no lawyer here who, if the proposition were put to him, would not say that Congress has the power to control the streets of Washington as against a corporation which, as gentlemen admit, has never been given any right over those streets—

Mr. PEARRE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. PEARRE. Does the gentleman deny as a proposition of law that Congress can not pass an act which deprives a man of his property without compensation?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not deny that.

Mr. PEARRE. Is not that the very basis on which this question turns?

Mr. HEPBURN. The streets of this city are not the property of any corporation; that is what I am trying to hammer into the heads of the gentlemen of the committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEARRE. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that while the streets are not their property, yet when rights are given to them in the streets those rights become their property, and if the gentleman would hammer into his own head some knowledge of constitutional law he would recognize my proposition.

Mr. HEPBURN. The right may belong to them until it is resumed by Congress.

Mr. PEARRE. You can not deprive them of a right once given.

Mr. HEPBURN. What I want is that we shall resume a right which belongs to the people, and which, as has been said here over and over again, has never been conferred upon this corporation.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman from Iowa seems to have a very firm conviction as to what kind of a measure we should pass here. I suggest to the gentleman that he draw a bill embodying his ideas, and our committee will act on it as soon as possible.

Mr. HEPBURN. If the committee will invite me to do that, I will do it for them. [Laughter.]

Mr. JENKINS. I want to say to the gentleman, further, that the same arguments which he has been making here for the last twenty minutes have been made by the representatives of the Bell Telephone Company before the Committee on the District of Columbia for the last two years.

Now, this bill promises to afford the people of this District relief within fourteen months. If the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa were carried out, the people would not get this relief in fourteen years; because, as the gentleman knows full well, as soon as anybody undertook to do anything under such a bill as he advocates, an injunction would issue out of one of the courts here and it would take at least fourteen years to determine whether or not Congress had a right to pass that act. For the present—

Mr. HEPBURN. Where does the gentleman propose to put his interrogation mark? [Laughter.]

Mr. JENKINS. I want to enlighten the gentleman. This is a question of reciprocity. The gentleman wants to aid us and we want to help him.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, another objection I have to this bill is the condition in which it will leave the streets of this city. There will have to be a conduit on both sides of every street, I take it.

Mr. BABCOCK. The conduits already constructed would be sufficient to accommodate one-half of the wires necessary. The bill provides for the leasing or purchase of conduits that have heretofore been constructed.

The SPEAKER. The hour of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HEPBURN addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Iowa opposed to the bill?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Does any member of the committee resist the bill and desire to take the floor? [A pause.] If not, the gentleman from Iowa will be recognized in opposition to the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire only a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for an hour.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am entirely willing to go with the committee as far as they would desire me to go in any measure for the relief of the people of Washington in respect to telephone service; but I doubt whether this bill will give the relief we want. It seems to me largely an attempt on the part of a number of gentlemen to get another hold on the franchises of this city. For that reason alone I would oppose the bill. If these franchises are valuable, let them be given to the people of Washington, who will

have an interest in maintaining them in their best possible condition—who will be in harmony with their neighbors here. Let them not be given to a lot of speculative gentlemen from a neighboring city. We have had experience enough with such gentlemen recently. We had a magnificent system of roads here—the Metropolitan road—which was the best equipped and best operated road that I ever saw. But it has now got into the hands of a lot of these Maryland gentlemen—Baltimore gentlemen, I am told—and now we have a service on that once magnificent line that would be a disgrace to any village in the United States. I object to the passage of this bill for that reason.

Mr. WACHTER. Did the gentleman ever see the street-car service of Baltimore City?

Mr. HEPBURN. I never did.

Mr. WACHTER. I took it for granted that the gentleman had not, or he would not talk in that way.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then this is modeled upon that, is it?

Mr. WACHTER. I do not know about that, but when you speak of Baltimore, I simply refer you to our magnificent street-car system, second to none in the United States to-day.

Mr. HEPBURN. I am talking about the system here, where you will find sometimes a score of cars blocked up together, with a space of miles between others.

Mr. WACHTER. You do not want to blame that on Baltimore City. We are not responsible for that.

Mr. HEPBURN. I am speaking of the system here, where you will see one train crowded with a hundred people and another right behind it with half a dozen people. I want to see no more of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are three or four serious objections to this bill. In the first place, it will not give full service. It will give only half service, if the other company continues, as it undoubtedly will. The most the new company can do is to divide the business.

In the second place, it is a foreign corporation, composed largely of foreign incorporators, and I think that is a bad feature.

In the third place, it does not necessarily cheapen rates, because there is no provision here that the 'phones that are to be furnished shall be upon a single wire, and I am told that now the other company, where six or eight 'phones are upon a single wire, are willing to give the same service for the same money. I think that it is an attempt here to build this plant with the bonds that are to be issued, while the stockholders, who get their stock perhaps for 10 cents on the dollar, will at all times insist upon full dividends upon their stock, the same as though they had paid money for it. I do not think the bill is properly guarded in many respects, and therefore I do not want to see it pass in its present form. I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PEARRE].

Mr. PEARRE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] fifteen minutes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Perhaps I had better use a portion of my time before the gentleman from Missouri proceeds.

Mr. COWHERD. Very well.

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if this bill should become a law and the company should commence to operate its plant, it would be necessary that it should tear up the streets of Washington. That, of course, in itself is undesirable, and if such right is granted to a company it ought to be obliged in some way to recompense the public. The great country at large pays half the cost of maintaining the streets of Washington. The great country at large has paid half the expense of putting down the present pavements of Washington, and if they are put in bad condition the country pays one-half of the cost of putting them in proper shape.

But here is a proposed law to give to this company the right to tear up every asphalt pavement in Washington, and we all know that they will not be put back in as good condition as they were before; and the only thing that this company proposes to pay for this great privilege is 1½ per cent of the gross receipts in place of taxes. The bill authorizes the company to issue \$750,000 of stock and \$750,000 of bonds, making a total of a million and a half dollars.

If it should pay 1 per cent on the amount of its stock and bonds, that 1 per cent would amount to \$15,000, and I do not believe that there is any place in the country where taxes are so low that a company is authorized to pay much less than 1 per cent on its investment. But here the proposition is to let this company avoid all taxes, to let this company out from the payment of all kinds of taxes on its property and franchises on payment of a nominal amount of 1½ per cent of its gross receipts.

Mr. BABCOCK. They are liable to assessment on their real estate the same as any other corporation or private person.

Mr. MANN. The company needs to own no real estate whatever.

Mr. BABCOCK. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MANN. The company is not required to own a foot of real estate anywhere. It can rent a power plant and rent an exchange building upon which it pays rent.

Mr. BABCOCK. The taxes on whatever real estate it occupies will have to be paid by somebody.

Mr. MANN. Its property consists of the right to use the streets. Why, all over this country everywhere there is a demand that companies having the right to use the streets shall pay a reasonable compensation. Even in the city of Chicago, which does not claim to be the best governed city in the world, no new company could be incorporated like this without paying at least 10 per cent of its gross receipts into the city treasury; and I compliment the other side of the House upon the fact that the mayor of that city, a Democrat, not only announced but maintains the principle that a private company, or a quasi public company, using the streets of the city must pay a corresponding compensation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the bill becomes a law, as I say, the company may go ahead and operate, in which case this will be the situation: Every public building in this city, every Government office in the city has now a telephone connected with the present company. Every hotel, every business house has a telephone connected with the wires of the present company. Is it designed that these offices, public buildings, and business houses shall each maintain two telephones?

I remember that something over ten years ago, in a portion of what is now the city of Chicago, then known as the village of Hyde Park, a new telephone company was authorized, was granted a franchise with a low rate like this, and it was said then that this company would force the rates of the old company down. It is true that the new company, unable to sell the franchise that it had, fitted up a small exchange and constructed a few miles of wire, but nobody wanted to use the telephones of that company because the great mass of subscribers to telephones were upon the exchange list of the old telephone company, and I believe that few men of good common sense now pretend to keep telephones connected with the exchange of the new company. This bill, then, would double the number of telephones if it amounted to anything by compelling people to maintain two telephones where they now maintain one.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not imagine that that would be the result. The only capital required by this bill to be invested is \$75,000. Does anybody believe that the old telephone company would permit its property to be ruined by a company which had invested only \$75,000? Is there any gentleman here so childlike and bland that he believes that if this bill becomes a law these gentlemen will not sell out their rights? Does any gentleman here believe that the old company, with a capital stock or an investment of one or two million of dollars, will permit a \$75,000 plant to run them out of Washington?

I have seen this thing so often in my own city. I have seen franchises granted to new companies so many times, and I never have known of a case where the old company did not purchase the plant in some way of the new company. I can remember when I was a member of the city council of Chicago that a new franchise was granted to a street-car company on the South Side of that city. It was said that the new street-car company would carry passengers for 3 cents a passenger.

It was said that it would do a great many things. It obtained its franchise, it fought its way through the lower courts and through the supreme court, and came out successful, and when it had absolutely established its rights under the law it sold out to the old company for \$1,000,000. I do not apprehend that this franchise will be worth a million dollars if it is passed, but I should like to help divide up the \$100,000 that these gentlemen from Baltimore will receive for their right.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman from Illinois has had great experience and observation about this telephone business. Everybody agrees that this whole community is now under unnecessary extortion at the hands of the existing telephone company. What practical scheme is there to deliver this community from extortionate telephone tolls?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if I could answer that question dogmatically, I could employ myself at the rate of many million dollars a year in the United States. There is no place that I know of where the people are not crying out against extortionate charges of some company which has been granted special rights in the streets.

I know of no absolutely certain way to control the situation, but my observation leads me to believe that doubling up the expense will not cheapen the cost to the consumer. You can not make it cheaper to the consumer by having double the amount invested. It is inevitable that the companies will be consolidated. There is no place in the United States—no place in the United States I say—where two companies remain long rivals for a single privilege. The gentleman says that I have had experience in connection with telephone service. I will say to the gentleman that I have had none, except as a subscriber.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I meant by practical observation of the operation.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt whatever that, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] says, Congress has authority to regulate the rates so far as this present company are concerned.

Mr. BABCOCK. Congress thought it had; the courts say it has not.

Mr. MANN. Ah, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin says that the courts have said nay. I say nay to his proposition, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as the city of Washington is concerned, as I said when this bill that they speak of was passed two years ago, it was nonsense then. I believed it then and I believe it now. I do not believe myself that in Washington you can maintain a good telephone service for \$36 a year on a single line; and the proposition that came up before the court was whether the old company should be obliged to furnish this telephone service and telephone instruments for the rate prescribed by Congress.

The court found that the service could not be furnished for that amount of money. If that be true, if the findings of the court are correct, nobody expects the telephone service to be furnished for less than the cost. If that be not true, if it be true that it can be furnished for less, then it is the duty of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Congress of the United States to furnish the proof; and all that is needed is proof. Gentlemen sat silently by while this test case was brought before the court, I know not whether in good faith or in ill faith, but I know that the court has not determined that we can not regulate the charges.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. I understand the gentleman to say that the service in this city can not be performed for \$36 a year?

Mr. MANN. That is my judgment.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. How is it, then, that it is performed, as I am reliably informed, in a great number of the cities of this country for \$36 a year?

Mr. MANN. I can answer that very well. We have a telephone in a small country town, for which we pay \$12 a year. I have another one in the city of Chicago, where I pay \$225 a year; and I get more than double the use and cheaper rate in proportion out of the \$225 a year telephone than I do out of the \$12 a year telephone. Why? Because one is used fifty times where the other is used once.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Does the gentleman consider that an answer to my question?

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly, I consider it an answer to your question.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Then I fail to see it.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that where a telephone exchange is small and the number of calls small the rate can be made very cheap; but gentlemen understand that where two men only are on a telephone the number of calls is small; but when you put three men on a line you do not merely double the telephone service; when you put four on a line you do not merely double it, but you multiply it sixfold; when you put a dozen on a line you multiply it by nearly a hundredfold, and that makes the difference in the cost.

Mr. PEARRE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PEARRE. Is not the net result of your argument this: That there is no relief from the extortionate charges that now exist in Washington?

Mr. MANN. It is not, Mr. Speaker. I say this first, that if the District or Congress can determine that the service which this company furnishes can be sustained by a charge of \$36 or \$50 a year, we have the power and authority to fix that rate.

Mr. PEARRE. Is the gentleman a lawyer?

Mr. MANN. Well, "the gentleman" does not practice law from Maryland for the benefit of clients in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PEARRE. No; but the gentleman seems to practice law in Washington for the benefit of the people of Chicago, Boston, and Washington. Now, the gentleman might just as well be courteous, because he will get along better, and answer the fair question which I have put.

Mr. MANN. "The gentleman" is always courteous when asked a courteous inquiry.

Mr. PEARRE. If that is the gentleman's notion of courtesy, it will not commend itself to the House.

Mr. MANN. "The gentleman" does not need your commendation to the House.

Mr. PEARRE. No; I am glad you do not. I fear you would not get it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEPBURN. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying that so far as my judgment is concerned the result of this bill will not be to furnish relief to the people of Washington, but simply to let people sell out under the bill or law which they obtain. But gentlemen have asked how they can obtain relief. It is not a hard road to ascertain or to travel.

It is admitted that the present company has no franchise in Washington; it is admitted that the present company came here as a usurper in Washington; it is admitted that it is not entitled under the law to occupy anything in Washington except so far as they may have vested rights. I would pass a law driving the present company out of Washington, except under terms fixed by Congress. You bring in a bill from the District Committee granting a franchise to the present company, as you have the right to, and give the company the right to accept it or to leave Washington.

Mr. SIMS. Why do you not introduce a bill which will carry out your idea, if you think that is a practical way?

Mr. MANN. I will tell the gentleman, who is a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I give very little attention myself to the District of Columbia business. I happened to notice this bill in the city press, and it was so remarkably similar to the boodle ordinances which I had fought in the city council for four years that it attracted my attention. I do not profess to study the legislation for the District of Columbia; it is the duty of the District Committee to bring in these bills; and if the committee is not able to do it, let them resign.

Mr. PEARRE. Is that the reason that it attracted the gentleman's attention, because of its resemblance to the boodle ordinances?

Mr. MANN. That is it precisely.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to say in all kindness to the gentleman from Illinois that the members of the District of Columbia Committee have not had the opportunity to live in so fraudulent a place and learn so much from fraudulent legislation as he speaks of. We have had no experience in matters of that kind. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman had had that experience, the committee would have recognized the earmarks on this bill. I am making no reflection on the Committee on the District of Columbia, but if they had known the devious ways of these men who are attempting to take the municipal franchises from the public in every city, they would have recognized this bill, and would never have brought in a favorable report.

Mr. SIMS. Why does not the gentleman offer an amendment to it?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to consume any more time?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. RAY of New York. With the consent of gentlemen, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have reprinted Senate bill 268 and the report. The gentleman who drew the report had the House bill before him when he drew it, and therefore made incorrect references and incorrect amendments. I simply desire to ask unanimous consent for the reprint of the report and the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for a reprint of Senate bill 268, and also the report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WASHINGTON TELEPHONE COMPANY.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I seem to stand upon this bill between Scylla and Charybdis. Among those opposing this legislation appear to be some who are friendly to the company now operating here. The other parties favoring this bill seem to represent a syndicate who, while it represents opposing interests to the present monopoly, seek to control the new company, and may be a second monopoly. They are certainly a shadowy prospective organization. At this point let me say that I neither belong to nor am I directly or indirectly interested in either the present monopoly or the proposed competing organization.

I want this legislation to pass in such shape that the proposed corporation will be of permanent benefit to the people of Washington, and if possible will be under their immediate control. By proper legislation this can be done, but I do not believe the passage of the measure in its present shape will bring about this much-desired result. By the passage of this bill without considerable amendment I can not see how the citizens of the District of Columbia will be either greatly benefited now or permanently benefited.

I call the committee's attention to the fact that to a Pennsylvanian accustomed to the drafting of charters under the laws of that State the provisions, or want of some of what we regard as essential provisions in a charter, give it a very peculiar look. First, the number of shares of stock to be issued is not fixed, nor is

the price per share. Why not specify these matters? I would suggest that the number of shares be fixed at 15,000 and the price per share \$50. Surely no objection could be made to that. Then every citizen who thinks a competing line desirable and will pay can at least subscribe for a share or two.

Again, some provision should be inserted by which, when the stock subscription books are opened, the citizens of the District and their friends would be allowed to subscribe a limited number of shares. By providing that no one person could subscribe to more than 100 shares until all who want that number or less are supplied, you will find that the corporation will be largely subscribed to by Washington citizens, and they will control the new organization.

Such control would contribute largely to its immediate success, not only as a remunerative investment, but as a competitive corporation who will deal fairly and liberally with all the people directly interested in securing first-rate service at reasonable rates. If the stock is to be taken by a few wealthy men whose only interests are how much they can make out of the new venture, little benefit will result to the people of the city, and will in the beginning, or in a short time, come into the hands of a new company, composed in large part of strangers.

There are so many ways by which these corporations can manipulate their affairs and thereby destroy an honest business competition that these or similar provisions should be now incorporated in the bill. We should prevent their selling out to either a competing company or to persons controlling, directly or indirectly, a competing company. We should provide against anything like establishing a monopoly by agreeing to operate in agreed-upon districts. We should provide against the watering of stocks and the many forms resorted to in the modern financing of corporations by which the vitality and usefulness of the company are impaired by those who go in on the ground floor.

I see nothing in the present bill to prevent the present monopoly, so bitterly complained of, from indirectly, if not directly, buying out and controlling the new competing line. In fact, the proposed company can, under the proposed charter, in a very short time freeze out the people who use telephones in the District. Let us put it beyond the power of this proposed corporation to do this, and I know of no more practical way to accomplish this result and every other desired result than by the provisions of the measure making it a Washington corporation, controlled by and managed by Washington people.

Again, the cumulative system of voting should be introduced, thereby preserving as much as possible the interests of the minority stockholders. In Pennsylvania we have found this a very valuable provision. I think its value here can not be overestimated. Our bounden duty here is to protect and legislate for the real interests of the people of Washington, not to grant special rights and privileges to those who have no more than a dollar and cent interest in the subject. Unless the bill is so amended, it should be defeated. Not that I want to see the establishment of any honest competing line either postponed or defeated. Washington requires not only competition, but honest competition. It is not outlined in the proposed measure. Let us correct it.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important measure; and I want to call the attention of gentlemen of the House to the situation that confronts the committee in bringing this bill before this body.

We are fighting here a corporation with \$64,000,000 behind it. We are fighting a corporation that has been established here now for almost twenty years. Gentlemen talk about opening subscription books and letting the people come in and take shares at ten or fifty dollars apiece, and no more than ten shares to one individual.

Why, sir, if the gentleman making that suggestion knows anything about a fight against a corporation backed with \$60,000,000, he knows that such a suggestion is vain and useless. We are giving these incorporators not a franchise, but a fight. They have got to make good every step of their progress against unlimited capital, that will buy, as it always does, the best brains in the market, and that will fight from behind barricades already erected for them.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has endeavored to bring in a fair bill—a bill against which there could be no reasonable complaint. I submit that the complaints which have been made have been general. Only one provision in the bill has been pointed out as subject to any specific objection, and that we propose to remedy by amendment.

Gentlemen say here, "This is a nebulous sort of a franchise." It is the same sort of a franchise, so far as that is concerned, that has been given to every corporation organized in this District for twenty years past. If it is nebulous, all the rest are nebulous. The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, when we come to legislate here we have legislators from forty-five different States; and each Representative thinks that if you do not follow the plan laid down in the statutes of his State, you are enacting bad legislation. It is such

legislation as Congress has sanctioned for a generation, and there is nothing in that contention.

The gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Pennsylvania have said that in this bill we are undertaking to pass an act which will enable some man to sell out and make money. Such a suggestion simply proves that neither of those gentlemen has read the bill. Now, in the first place, under this bill these gentlemen must incorporate; and if they fail to incorporate, what happens? The charter and everything under it is forfeited. But if they do go ahead and organize, what happens then? They must within fifteen days put up \$100,000 as a guaranty that they will perform the conditions of this charter. A gentleman has said that the old company would buy off these corporators because they are required to put only \$75,000 into the enterprise to organize it. They not only put up the \$75,000, but they put up \$100,000 more; and if they sell out, the \$100,000 is forfeited to the Government of the United States. Who is hurt by that provision? Anybody in the District of Columbia or any taxpayer in the city of Washington?

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman please call attention to that part of the bill where it is provided that somebody must put up \$100,000 within fifteen days?

Mr. COWHERD. Why, there is a provision that a bond shall be given in the sum of \$100,000. Does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman understand that that bond would amount to anything?

Mr. COWHERD. Provision is made so that suit may be brought on that bond and that the sum named in the bond shall be taken as liquidated damages if the incorporators do not carry out the provisions of the charter.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that any court of the country would sustain a provision for a bond of that kind?

Mr. COWHERD. I do think so. The courts have sustained an exactly similar provision. I think I could cite the gentleman to such cases.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me a question for information?

Mr. COWHERD. Oh, yes; that is what we are here for.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. It is upon the point to which I called the attention of the gentleman from Maryland a short time ago.

Mr. COWHERD. I am going to reach that later.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. My question relates to the issuance of stocks and bonds.

Mr. COWHERD. I will come to that a little later on, if the gentleman will permit me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this bill we are endeavoring not only to legislate for the benefit of the people of Washington, but to enact legislation that will be operative to permit this company to successfully engage in the great fight which is to come between it and the present company.

Suppose this bill does go into effect. If the company does not incorporate, nobody is hurt. If they do incorporate, they put up a bond for \$100,000; which amount will be forfeited to the United States if they do not carry out the provisions of the bill.

But suppose they go ahead, and, after fighting the existing system for a while, sell out, as suggested by gentlemen around me. In that case it is provided that the parties who purchase shall hold their property subject to all the limitations mentioned in the charter; and if the purchase is made by any other company operating a telephone line here, then all other rights or franchises which such company may hold shall be subject to the limitations of this charter. And what are those limitations? That they must furnish a business telephone for \$48 a year and a residence telephone for \$36.

Gentlemen talk of telephones at cheaper rates in smaller towns. It is true that some small towns do have cheaper rates for telephone service; but thus far, since the consolidation, as I am informed, in Detroit, there is no city in the United States of the size of Washington where telephone service is in operation at these rates.

Now, a company of gentlemen come before our committee. They come representing large financial interests. They are men who are capable and able to carry out what they agree to do, and they say to us: "We will put up an absolutely gilt-edge bond for a hundred thousand dollars conditioned that we will within the time limited here furnish a system capable of supplying as many users of telephones as are now using the telephone in this city, and we will guarantee to furnish the service at the rates named in the bill, and you can take the \$100,000 as liquidated damages if we do not carry out our contract."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the bill provide that they shall give that bond?

Mr. COWHERD. Yes; that they shall give it, and give it before anything is done under the charter.

Mr. PEARRE. If they do not give it the charter is forfeited.

Mr. COWHERD. That is correct. If they do not give it the charter is forfeited. Do you not want to try it, gentlemen? If you try it and it is successful, you set the precedent in the United States for a reduction of telephone rates, a service that is to-day the most exorbitant of any monopoly holding a municipal franchise. If you do that, gentlemen, it will be followed all over the United States, and millions of dollars will be saved to the people of the country.

Now, some gentlemen say you ought to reduce the rates lower. I can only say that so far there has never been any definite determination of what is a fair telephone rate. They attempted to determine it here in the courts of this District, and the court held that \$50 a year was too small, and that you could not furnish good telephone service here for that sum—that is, \$50 each for business and residence telephones. Yet this company comes in here and offers to do it for \$48 and \$36.

Now, gentlemen, I submit the criticisms that have been leveled against the members of this committee for bringing in this bill are not just criticisms.

Let me note some of the objections that gentlemen have raised, and I want to call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], who criticises the service now being rendered by the Metropolitan Street Railway Company, to the fact that on the floor of this House in the last Congress he stood here demanding that these companies be allowed to consolidate. He said that Congress, with its strong hand, could reach and remedy any detriment to the service that might arise. He said that we held control over that company, and the minute they did not do what they ought to do we would bring them to time.

Now he stands before the same body, telling you that you can reach some other company, but admits that he was wrong in that instance, or else he is negligent now in his duty in regard to that company. Some of us fought that consolidation then. We said then that competition was the thing. We said then that if you allowed them to consolidate, these little neglects would arise and you could not reach them.

In regard to the question of a single wire to each 'phone an amendment has been proposed. Mark you, we provide, first, that there shall be a maximum charge of \$48 and \$36, and now we propose this amendment:

Provided, That if more than one telephone is put upon a wire the rates above fixed shall be reduced—

Compelling a reduction if more than one telephone is put upon a wire—

in accordance with such regulations as may be made by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Permitting a reduced rate for two telephones, a greater reduction for three, a still greater reduction for four, and yet leaving a provision whereby wires may be run a great distance and some compensation left to the company.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COWHERD. I should like to have a few minutes more.

Mr. PEARRE. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COWHERD. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to this decision that has been referred to. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa about that. I doubt the law of that decision, or rather I doubt the finding of facts on which the law is based; but it is the decision of the court. Unless it is overruled by some higher court it will stand. That case has been appealed.

The question now is whether we ought to wait the number of years that it may take that case to go through the Supreme Court. Probably, as all lawyers know, if it is reversed, it will be reversed for another trial and take years again for its trial in the lower courts and its appeal to the Supreme Court, with the people of the District of Columbia paying \$200,000 every year of that time for service that would be rendered under this bill for less than a hundred thousand dollars. Why, in the four or five years that it would take to litigate that matter through the various courts you would probably save enough under this bill to build another telephone system.

I will not read from the decision in that case. My time is so limited I content myself with saying that it is held that Congress has no power to pass laws impairing the obligations of contracts; that rights have been given to these people to use the streets here and certain rights under certain bills passed, and that Congress can not make a rate at which they can not furnish the service; and if you can not compel them to furnish the service at the rate you make, then, I assert, you can not impair their rights further by taking away entirely the franchises of the company.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I should like to ask the gentleman a question for the information of members of the House.

Mr. COWHERD. I will answer the gentleman's question if I can.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I simply wanted to know, for information, how did this present company get the use of the streets?

Mr. COWHERD. They came in here and asked permission to string some wires and got that permission, as I believe, from the Commissioners, and then Congress took some telephones. Congress, by appropriation bills, authorized payment for telephones, permission was given them to construct a conduit, and things of that kind. There was never any charter given.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. They rely upon some sort of an implied contract.

Mr. COWHERD. Yes; some sort of implied contract, growing out of these recognitions of their rights in the District of Columbia by Congress.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois has said you are going to let another company come in and tear up the streets and leave your streets all torn up. Why, gentlemen ought to know that there is a general law in this District under which a man digs in the streets; that he has to go to the Commissioners of the District to get permission, that he has to give security that he will repair the streets when through with his work, that he has to protect it with lights, barriers, and things of that kind, and that after the work is done he must see that the street is put back in perfect condition.

I admit that it would be better, if we could, to fix a decent rate and compel one company to stand by it, and it would be better if that company could be the old company. I should be willing to do that; but we tried to do it, and that case was taken into the court, and the court decided that the telephone company could not live under the rates that we fixed. They swore to that; they proved it to the satisfaction of the court.

I do not want to be understood as agreeing with that decision of the court. To furnish an excuse for their charges the Bell companies here and elsewhere enter into contract with equipment companies, in which they hold the majority of the stock, by which they rent the apparatus they use, paying enormous royalties, practically to themselves. They pay \$7.50 a year for each receiver and transmitter. All other companies buy their instruments outright, paying \$9 for a receiver and transmitter. They pay practically to themselves \$1 per year for each drop on the switchboard, when it could be bought for \$3 or \$4.

Such legerdemain, taking money out of one pocket to put it in another, ought not to be considered by a court when it comes to passing upon what is a fair rate. But the court has passed upon it and said we could not reduce the rate to \$50, and now responsible men come to your committee and say they will give you a better rate than that, and you say we ought not to take it; that we ought to go back to the old company and in some way get them to come in and do the work at the rate which these people offer. I believe that the result of such legislation as this will be that the old company will immediately come down or be forced out of business. If they buy this charter, they will have to come down. If they sell out to the new company, the new company will operate under this charter.

Now, just a word in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I want to say frankly for myself—and I believe we ought to be frank with the House in regard to these matters—that I thought it was the duty of this committee, endeavoring as they were to obtain the cheapest telephone system in the United States, with a proposition from responsible people that they would either give it to us or forfeit a hundred thousand dollars, knowing as we did that they had to come in competition with the strongest company in the United States, that would fight them through every inch of the way, through the courts, through Congress, before the people, and everywhere else—I thought we ought to give them a liberal charter. I did not believe the risk would be taken unless the inducement was commensurate with the risk.

Now, with no other telephone service in the United States furnished at these rates to-day, with a decision of the courts of this District that you can not furnish it at this rate, or even at a higher rate, I do not believe that you can put the stock on the market and sell it for 10 cents on the dollar. Does any man in this House believe it? I was willing to say to these people: "We will give you a liberal charter."

It may be that they will get some watered stock into it. For myself, I am willing that they should water the stock a little if they reduce the rates 50 per cent to the people of the District of Columbia. You will save to the subscribers in this city a hundred thousand dollars a year and improve the service under this bill. I am willing that the new company should be paid for doing that.

I submit to you, gentlemen, that every objection that has been made has been an objection that has either been fairly answered in the terms of the bill or an objection that has no merits in it.

I submit to you that this is one of the most meritorious measures ever brought before this House of Representatives, and I call upon every man who believes that the people of the District of Columbia should be represented as you would represent your own community if you were at home voting in a city council—I call upon every man who believes that the present telephone rates in

this District are exorbitant (and I for one am convinced they are) to rally around this bill and give us an opportunity to do justice to the people of the District of Columbia. [Applause.]

I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of giving some figures.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. COWHERD. The following statement showing the cost and operation of lines other than those connected with the Bell Telephone Company in cities where competition has been instituted I take from the brief of Messrs. A. A. Birney and H. F. Woodward, counsel for complainants in the case above referred to. The facts set forth were gleaned from the evidence taken in the trial of that case:

NEW STATE TELEPHONE COMPANY, MICHIGAN.

The testimony as to this company and the financial results of its rates is complete. November 1, 1898, it operated 134 exchanges in Michigan, and about 3,000 telephones, the largest exchanges being Ann Arbor, with 505 telephones, and Port Huron, with 313, and the smallest Dearborn, with 4. The system is almost exclusively the metallic circuit, and the instrument of the long-distance type. The rates for service are \$24 for business and \$18 for residence telephones.

To determine the results all original papers were produced for the examination of counsel and the fullest exhibit made from August, 1897, to October 31, 1898.

For the ten months beginning January 1, 1898, the gross receipts of this company were \$59,904.74, of which \$30,714.62 was profit.

CITIZENS' TELEPHONE COMPANY OF GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

Since the proof about this plant is exact, and the number of instruments in use closely approximates those in use in Washington, the results shown are most important.

This company has operated since July 1, 1896; its construction is aerial, all service over the metallic circuit; its instruments are of the long-distance type. The actual cost of construction to January 1, 1899, was \$169,000. The company has issued no bonds, but built the plant from sales of stock, of which, on July 1, 1898, it had issued \$129,000. It has 2,508 stations; its franchise limits rates to \$36 and \$24, but the rates charged are \$30 and \$20 on three-year contracts.

The construction is first-class, and cost \$65 to \$67 per station. It operates its 2,508 lines at an annual cost of \$18 per telephone. Its receipts for the year ended June 30, 1898, were \$57,000, and its expenses \$37,000, the average number of telephones in use being 2,200. The expense includes \$1,800 for taxes. For a year and a half the company has paid quarterly dividends of 2 per cent each.

HOME TELEPHONE COMPANY, FORT WAYNE, IND.

Has two exchanges in Fort Wayne, and connects through toll lines not owned by it with 50 to 75 towns in the neighborhood.

Has 2 miles underground conduit, containing 8 miles of duct. About 40 linear miles in Fort Wayne system. City has about 50,000 population, and has 5 lines of electric street railways. December 31, 1898, the company had 1,624 instruments in use in Fort Wayne, being an increase from 1,320 during the year.

About one-half of the lines are metallic circuits, the others have the common return. All business telephones are of the long-distance type. Of the 1,624 telephones on December 31, 1898, 562 were business and 1,062 residence, and 39 free for city officials. Regular rates, \$36 and \$24, or \$48 for both to one person. Capital stock authorized, \$250,000; issued, \$125,000. Bonds, \$125,000, bearing 6 per cent interest. Cost of construction, \$247,748.33 to October 1, 1898, the expenditure for construction during the preceding year being \$50,243.49.

Detailed monthly reports of the business from October 1, 1897, to December 31, 1898, and the annual report to stockholders made October, 1898, were produced for inspection of counsel, and the annual report was put in evidence. This shows earnings for the year, \$32,674.92; expense, \$17,846.85; net earnings, \$14,828.07, out of which was paid for interest on bonds and dividends \$10,793.54. A share of stock was given with each bond purchased.

RICHMOND, VA.

The independent company, the Richmond Telephone Company, commenced business July 1, 1896, with less than 600 telephones, and now has about 1,300. Service is all metallic; no party lines. Construction aerial, on large cables strung on poles 60 feet high, put up in the alleys. Poles are all chestnut.

The company paid for construction \$75 in its bonds for each telephone station up to 1,200; pays \$10.50 for telephones, buying principally from American Electric Telephone Company and Western Telephone Construction Company, and uses switchboard made by latter company; pays taxes to city of about \$3,000; rates, \$36 and \$24. In 1898 the average from telephone rental was \$32.68 each for the year; amount collected, \$36,720.10; then number of telephones, 1,229; average collected per telephone, \$29.89; average expense per telephone, \$23.61.

Before the company commenced business the Southern Bell Telephone Company occupied the field. Its rates were \$60 and \$48 for first half mile; now \$30 and \$18. The plant of the Richmond company has all been constructed from \$95,000 bonds sold and earnings above expense. Copper wire is used in all cables and steel wires between cables and houses. Over two-thirds of the telephones are in use by business houses.

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN.

Population, between 250,000 and 280,000. Two companies, one operated by the Government and the other by private enterprise—the General Telephone Company.

THE GENERAL TELEPHONE COMPANY.

Began business in 1883; paid-up capital, £160,000; rates for service, \$27. In 1894 had 10,346 subscribers' instruments; had paid dividends of 8 per cent from the beginning, and had acquired property valued at the end of 1894, after eleven years' working, at £205,643, besides building up substantial reserves, employees' accident and benevolent funds, and paying for the conversion of the whole of its Stockholm system from single to double wire.

OTHER CONTINENTAL RATES.

The statistics given are for 1894 and taken from Mr. Bennett's book, Telephone Systems of the Continent of Europe:

Austria (State control)—14,483 subscribers, of whom 7,700 were in Vienna (49); rates, \$25 (page 34).

Bavaria—Munich, 5,000 subscribers; Nuremberg, 2,500 subscribers (51); rates, \$36.40.

Belgium (State control)—Brussels, 2,506 subscribers; rates, \$50; subscription covers other towns (72).

Denmark (private companies)—Copenhagen, 4,510 subscribers; rate, \$40.52 (108).

Finland (private companies)—Helsingfors, 2,150 subscribers; rate, \$23.45 (132).

France (State monopoly)—Paris, 12,500 subscribers; rate, \$80; Lyons, 1,200 subscribers; rate, \$60 (136, 174).

German Empire (State monopoly)—Berlin, 25,000 subscribers; Hamburg, 9,200 subscribers; rate, \$37.50 (184). (Webb, 352.)

Holland (private companies)—Amsterdam, 1,752 subscribers; Rotterdam, 961; rate, \$47.55; dividend of 9 per cent in 1894 (226, 249).

Italy (concessions)—Business, \$37.50; residence, \$28 (303).

Russia (concessions)—St. Petersburg, 1,400 lines; Moscow, 1,400; rate \$125, the highest in Europe.

Spain (concessions, the plants to belong to the State after twenty years (327)—Rates in cities of 200,000 and more, \$27.50 and \$30 (323).

Switzerland (State monopoly)—\$8 per annum and \$25 per hundred calls (378).

Mr. PEARRE. I yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have no special concern about and certainly no special feeling of interest in this particular bill further than the desire to do just what is right and just to the people, who are deeply interested in this telephone subject-matter under the circumstances in which they now find themselves. On the 14th of February, 1898, I introduced a resolution, which the House adopted, requesting the Speaker of this House to appoint a special committee to inquire into the subject-matter of telephone rates in the District of Columbia, and as a result of the investigations of that committee and the evidence taken in court in the case to which much reference has been made here, I am convinced that telephone rates can be fixed and found practicable and reasonable in this District at figures that are no higher than those provided by this bill.

So far as observations have been made by the gentleman from Iowa as to this company being a Maryland corporation, I want to make this remark: There has been no disposition that I am aware of to give a franchise to these particular incorporators in preference to any others. There has certainly been no such disposition on my part. I did not originally favor any bill giving it to these incorporators. I introduced a bill—I do not know the exact number of it—incorporating a number of Washington people under practically the same terms as provided in this bill and for the same purposes. There was but little if any restriction as to those who should come in. I think the number of people taken in as incorporators was about 15 or 20 reputable, substantial business men of this city.

But after this bill had been prepared, and after it had been undergoing consideration to some extent by the committee, a number of the incorporators of the previous bill came to the committee and said that they were of the opinion that these gentlemen represented greater financial ability; that theirs was likely a more bona fide concern; that it could more likely cope with success with the present telephone monopoly in the District; so that, yielding my personal preference, I concluded to support and am now supporting this bill as the best proposition that had been presented to the committee and as representing the best efforts of that committee in the preparation of a measure out of which they had any reason to hope for anything like practical success.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this matter, in my judgment, has come practically to an issue between the people of the District of Columbia upon the one side and the monopoly known as the American Bell Telephone Company upon the other, and when it comes to that, sir, I am in favor of the people of the District of Columbia, almost all of whom have signified their preference for this bill as against the unreasoning and exorbitant exactions to which they are subjected at the hands of this American Bell Telephone Company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand—in fact, it is well understood—that a court in this District has solemnly declared that it costs \$71 a year for each telephone in this city, operated by the American Bell Telephone Company, or its offspring, the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company, under which name it operates and does business in this District; and that if Congress undertakes to require that company to provide service for rates less than that amount, such legislation is tantamount to confiscation of its property and therefore unconstitutional.

It is not likely that we will get from any such court a decision in the near future that is more favorable to the people of the District or less favorable to the telephone company. We can expect no relief, therefore, from that source.

Here, on the other hand, are a number of reputable gentlemen, who stand high in the financial world, who come to us and say, and offer to give a financial guaranty to the extent of \$100,000, that they are willing to give to the city this service of the same character its people are now receiving and better, each telephone having a separate wire, and each having a metallic circuit, each subscriber getting unlimited service, and at rates for the best service that they are now getting that are lower by more than one-half than those that the present company charges for its cheapest and most inefficient service; and yet gentlemen would have this House pause here and do nothing to relieve this situation, because they say this is not a perfect bill, and they undertake to persuade the House and themselves that it is better for the

House to repeal or revoke the power of the present company that is now providing the only telephone service in the District and leave the District with no service at all.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the same opinion as the gentleman from Iowa, to the effect that the American Bell Telephone Company or its representative, the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Company, has no franchise at all in this District. They have never been given any franchise by Congressional action. They have only obtained, from time to time, permission from the District Commissioners to locate their wires here, and they have subsequently, from time to time, received a quasi-Congressional recognition of that location by provisions, generally in appropriation bills, as to the manner of the location of those wires.

I deny the proposition that that company has any vested right at all that Congress is bound to respect. They may have what might be termed and considered as a revocable license or privilege for the location of their plant and wires here, which this Congress can repeal or revoke or rescind at any time that it sees fit; but, sir, admitting that we can do that, there is no reason why we should not pass the legislation provided in this bill. Indeed, if we have any idea of doing that, then it is with much greater reason that while we are contemplating the doing of it we should provide the District of Columbia with something else and something better.

It is said, and I am sure with truthfulness, that the rates provided in this bill are about as low as are found by comparison with cities elsewhere in the country that have about the same population and about the same telephone service as Washington City. To-day, in the District of Columbia, considering the amount of the service and the character of the service, I think I do not fall far away from the fact when I say that the prevailing rates are among the highest rates in the United States, if not, in fact, in the world.

No such condition of things ought to be allowed to prevail in this District. The Congress of the United States, sitting, as it does, as the legislature for the District of Columbia, should not permit these companies for one moment longer such concessions as have been granted and such extortionate and oppressive rates as they are now charging; and Congress would not allow the existence of such conditions if members would bear in mind clearly the character of the responsibility which rests upon them as the legislative body of this municipality, and would consider the interests of the people of this District in their action upon this bill as they would were they the people of their own States and cities of their own States. It is with such view as to their duty, and with such sense of responsibility, that I ask gentlemen to consider this bill, and, so considering it, I do not believe we will fail to enact it into law.

Mr. PEARRE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to send two amendments to the Clerk's desk and have them read for the information of the House, and to be pending.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin sends to the desk two amendments which he desires to have read for information.

Mr. HEPBURN. The time for offering amendments has not come. That does not cut off the balance of my time that I have reserved, and the amendments could only be read for information.

Mr. BABCOCK. They can be read in my time.

Mr. HEPBURN. They can only be read for information at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland yields time to the gentleman for an amendment, and of course the gentleman can offer it, and the amendment will be read.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Insert in line 15, page 6, after the word "dollars," the words "to consist of 7,500 shares at \$100 per share."

Amend by adding at the end of section 3 the following words: "Provided, That if more than one telephone is put on a wire the rates herein fixed shall be reduced in accordance with such regulations as may be made by the Commissioners of the District."

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire a vote on the amendments now?

Mr. BABCOCK. I desire to be heard, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BABCOCK. The object, Mr. Speaker, of presenting this bill to the House is to secure proper and reasonable rates and to enlarge the telephone service. Under the rates now existing in the city of Washington we have about 2,000 telephones, and the committee believe that after this service is installed there will be 5,000 telephones in use. I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that the committee has given this subject its careful consideration for years. As I stated before on the floor, this is the first proposition that has in it the elements of what the committee considered practicability and success. The committee has carefully examined into the record of every corporate name, and the incorporators are not only responsible but able financially, and the committee has reason to believe that they intend to accept this charter and

file the bond for \$100,000 to comply with the provisions of the charter.

Not only that, but I have been advised by responsible trust companies, whose bonds are good for almost any amount, that if this charter was granted they would furnish the required bond.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a subject that Congress has discussed through appropriation bills a good many times, and I have to say on behalf of the committee that its entire day was taken away from it last Monday, and that one-half of to-day has been taken away from the committee by privileged measures, and on this question, and for the reason that I believe the House is sufficiently informed, I now move the previous question on the bill and pending amendments to its passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Before the gentleman calls for the previous question—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Before the previous question is called I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. BABCOCK. There is only thirty minutes more remaining of the session, and will the gentleman wait—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It is now or never.

Mr. BABCOCK. I believe the House is ready to consider it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman call for the previous question on the bill and amendments?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I protest, Mr. Speaker, that there ought to be an opportunity to amend the bill. I have no objection to the gentleman calling for the previous question on the general debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi will bear in mind that we are in the House and not in Committee of the Whole, and the gentleman from Wisconsin having charge of the bill has asked for the previous question. If the House is not satisfied with the bill and wants to amend it, it can vote it down.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. If the Speaker will excuse me, I did not forget that we were in the House, but I made the remark supposing the House would vote the previous question up. I should be glad if the House would vote it down, so that the House will have an opportunity to amend the bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. I will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi to offer his amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had an hour, and by arrangement the other side used a portion of the time. I reserved the balance of my time. There are two gentlemen on this side of the House who desire to address the House. How does it happen that the gentleman from Wisconsin gets the floor and takes me off the floor in that way?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa must bear in mind that when he reserves his time it is subject to the condition that the House may never allow him to use it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin yields to me to offer an amendment, and I offer the following:

In line 4, on page 7, after the word "company," insert the following: "or a controlling interest in the stock thereof."

I want to say this in explanation of the amendment. This is the clause of the bill which provides for the most essential thing, in my opinion, in the bill—the means whereby the old company, if it buys up the new company, are to comply with the restrictions provided for in the bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. The committee accepts the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BABCOCK. For what purpose?

Mr. HEPBURN. I want to offer an amendment.

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment:

In line 12, page 2, strike out the following words: "and to string wires on poles in the alleys of said city in the District of Columbia."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, lines 12 to 14, strike out the following words: "and to string wires on poles in alleys of said city in the District of Columbia."

Mr. BABCOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion for the previous question on the bill and amendments to its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks for the previous question on the bill and amendments to its passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendments offered by the Committee on the District of Columbia were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the first amendment offered from the floor.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 15, page 6, after the word "dollars," the following: "to consist of 7,500 shares, at \$100 per share."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of section 3 the following words: "Provided, That if more than one telephone is put on a wire, the rate herein fixed shall be reduced in accordance with such regulations as may be made by the Commissioners of the District."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 4, page 7, after the word "company," insert "or a controlling interest in the stock thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was read, as follows:

After the word "wire," in line 12, page 2, strike out the following: "and to string wires on poles in the alleys of said city and in the District of Columbia."

Mr. BABCOCK. I hope this amendment will be voted down.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I move to recommit the bill with instructions to report an amendment to section 11, as follows:

That no stock or bonds shall be issued except in exchange for actual cash.

Mr. BABCOCK. I move that this motion be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] is out of order.

Mr. BABCOCK. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I move to recommit the bill with instructions to insert the following amendment—

The SPEAKER. Only one motion to recommit is in order. The gentleman's motion can not be entertained.

The question being taken, the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS MEMORIAL AND HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Mr. BABCOCK. There is, I believe, on the Speaker's table unfinished business from the last District day.

The SPEAKER. The bill to which the gentleman refers had reached the point of third reading when the reading of the engrossed copy was demanded, and the bill was temporarily laid aside. For the information of the House the bill will be reported by its title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3597) to incorporate the Frederick Douglass Memorial and Historical Association.

Mr. COWHERD. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether he will not yield for a request for unanimous consent to amend the bill by striking out section 7. I think this amendment will remove all objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Before the amendment can be made the order for the engrossment and third reading of the bill must be reconsidered. Is there objection to the reconsideration? The Chair hears none. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] to strike out the seventh section? The Chair hears no objection.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

TAX SALES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8466) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia."

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of February 28, 1898, entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out all after the word "sale," in line 8 of said section.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 9283) to regulate insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin calls up a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill (H. R. 9283) to regulate insurance in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

During the reading,

Mr. JENKINS said: Mr. Speaker, on account of the lateness of the hour and the importance of this measure, several gentlemen

desire that it may be withdrawn, and I will ask unanimous consent that it go over without prejudice. We do not care to rush anything through without proper consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to call up another bill to-night?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. We are perfectly willing to occupy the time until 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman then can withdraw it for the time being.

Mr. JENKINS. We will withdraw it without prejudice.

GUARANTY COMPANIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9143) to authorize the formation of guaranty companies in the District of Columbia.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any company now authorized or which may hereafter be authorized by act of Congress to do an insurance business in the District of Columbia, having a paid-up capital of not less than \$250,000, may engage in a security, guaranty, and indemnity business; and where by law two or more sureties are required upon any obligation which said company is authorized to insure it may act as sole surety thereon and may be accepted by the court or other officer or person authorized to approve the sufficiency of any bond or undertaking.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JENKINS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

WESLEY HEIGHTS RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7502) to incorporate the Wesley Heights Railway Company of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin calls up the following bill.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the substitute be read in lieu of the original bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the substitute for the original bill will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That M. C. Butler, John T. Arms, Thomas E. Waggon, Dr. Henry D. Fry, and John F. Waggaman, of the city of Washington, D. C., their associates and assigns, be, and they hereby are, created a body corporate under the name of "The Wesley Heights Railway Company."

ROUTE.

SEC. 2. That the company is authorized to construct and operate a street railway along the following-named route: Beginning on Prospect avenue at the Union Passenger Station of the Capital Traction Company; thence westwardly along Prospect avenue and Prospect avenue extended to a point near the east side of Arizona avenue, or for said distance or any portion thereof on a route coinciding with the route of the Washington and Great Falls Electric Railway; thence on property to be acquired by said company to Arizona avenue; thence northerly along Arizona avenue to a projected avenue running northwest through the intersection of Forty-fifth and Galveston streets; thence along said projected avenue to Forty-fifth street; thence north on Forty-fifth street to Lowell street; thence west on Lowell street to and into an extension of the aforesaid projected avenue; thence northwest on said projected avenue to a point where Forty-ninth street, when extended, will intersect said avenue; thence north on Forty-ninth street to the District line: *Provided*, That where this route lies between the lines of a proposed highway the company shall acquire a right of way, not less than 30 feet wide, in the center thereof; and all rights of way acquired within the lines of proposed highways shall be dedicated to the use of the public before a permit is issued for the construction of the railway therein: *Provided further*, That where the route is along a road less than 60 feet wide the company shall, at its own expense, widen said road to 60 feet in width before a permit is issued for the construction of the railroad therein.

COINCIDING ROUTE.

SEC. 3. That where this route coincides with an existing street railway one set of tracks shall be used in common, upon terms mutually agreed upon, or in case of disagreement, upon terms determined by the supreme court of the District of Columbia, which is authorized and directed to give hearing to the interested parties and to fix the terms of joint trackage. Payments for the use of the tracks shall be paid monthly, in advance; default in such payments shall suspend the rights of the company to use the tracks until the payments are made.

MOTIVE POWER.

SEC. 4. That the motive power shall be electricity, and if the trolley system is used a return wire of equal capacity to the feed wire and similarly insulated must be provided, and each car shall be equipped with a double trolley. No portion of the electrical circuit shall, under any circumstances, be allowed to pass through the earth, and neither pole of any dynamo furnishing power to the line shall be grounded.

PLANS.

SEC. 5. That all plans of location and construction shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

EXCAVATIONS.

SEC. 6. That excavations in the highways shall be made under permits from the Commissioners and subject to regulations prescribed by them.

CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 7. That the railway and its appurtenances shall be constructed in a substantial and durable manner. Such construction shall be subject to District inspection. All changes to existing structures in public space shall be made at the expense of the company.

DEPOSITS.

SEC. 8. That the company shall deposit such sums as the Commissioners shall require to cover the cost of District inspection and the cost of changes to public works in the streets.

CARE OF ROADWAY.

SEC. 9. That the company shall keep the space between its rails and tracks and 2 feet exterior thereto in good condition, to the satisfaction of the

Commissioners. The pavement of these spaces shall be at least as good as that of the contiguous roadway. The proper authorities shall have the right to make changes of grade and other improvements which they deem necessary; and when any highway occupied by the company is improved, the company shall bear the entire expense of improving said spaces to correspond with the remainder of the roadway. The requirements of this section shall be enforceable under the provisions of section 5 of the act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia, approved June 11, 1878.

COMPLETION.

SEC. 10. That the road shall be in operation for its entire length within the District of Columbia within two years from the approval of this act.

GUARANTY DEPOSIT.

SEC. 11. That within ninety days from the approval of this act the company shall deposit \$1,000 with the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia to guarantee the construction of its railway within the prescribed time. If this sum is not so deposited, this charter shall be void. If this sum is so deposited and the road is not in operation as herein prescribed, said \$1,000 shall be forfeited to the District of Columbia and this charter shall be void.

CARS.

SEC. 12. That the cars shall be first class, and shall be kept in good condition, to the satisfaction of the Commissioners.

TIME-TABLE.

SEC. 13. That the cars shall be run as often as the public convenience requires, on a time-table satisfactory to the Commissioners and approved by them.

SPEED.

SEC. 14. That the speed of cars shall be subject to the police regulations of the District of Columbia.

EJECTION FROM CARS.

SEC. 15. That persons drunk, disorderly, contagiously diseased, or refusing to pay the legal fare may be ejected from the cars by the officers in charge thereof.

SEC. 16. That the rate of fare within the District of Columbia shall not exceed 5 cents per passenger, and six tickets shall be sold for 25 cents.

BUILDINGS.

SEC. 17. That the company is authorized to erect and maintain the buildings necessary to the operation of its road, subject to the building regulations of the District of Columbia. The company shall erect and maintain passenger rooms and transfer stations as required by the Commissioners, and proper conveniences for the public shall be provided at such rooms and stations.

LAND.

SEC. 18. That the company is authorized to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, the necessary land for its authorized right of way.

ORGANIZATION.

SEC. 19. That the corporators shall open books of subscription to the capital stock of the company within three months from the approval of this act, of which previous notice shall be given every day for one week by advertisement in a newspaper published in the city of Washington. The corporators herein named shall be individually liable for moneys received for subscriptions to the capital stock prior to the organization of the company by the stockholders. Within six months from the approval of this act the company shall be organized by the stockholders, for which purpose the corporators shall call a meeting of the stockholders, notifying them of the purpose, time, and place of such meeting by a letter mailed to each, and giving additional notice by advertisement in a newspaper published in the city of Washington every day for one week previous to such meeting; and thereafter the stockholders shall meet at least once a year, and such notice shall be given of each meeting. Each share of paid-up stock shall entitle the holder to one vote. The stockholders are empowered to elect a president, treasurer, a secretary, a board of directors, and other officers, and to make by-laws and regulations for the government of the company.

CAPITAL STOCK.

SEC. 20. That the company is authorized to issue capital stock, to an amount not exceeding \$200,000, in shares of \$10 each. Stock sold by the company shall be fully paid for before delivery to purchaser. Stockholders shall be individually liable to the extent of the value of the stock held by them.

ANNUAL REPORT.

SEC. 21. That the company shall make an annual report to the Senate and House of Representatives in accordance with the provisions of section 10 of an act to amend the routes of the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company and the Belt Railway Company, approved June 10, 1896.

TAXES.

SEC. 22. That the company shall pay 4 per cent of its gross earnings in the District of Columbia as taxes. Said taxes shall be paid on the basis of the receipts for the preceding year, and shall be due and payable, subject to the same penalties on arrears, and collectible in the same manner, as other taxes in the District of Columbia. The company's real estate shall be taxed as other real estate, but its tracks shall not be taxed.

PENALTIES.

SEC. 23. That each and every violation of the requirements of this act shall be punishable by a fine of from twenty-five to one thousand dollars, in the discretion of the court, such fines to be collectible in any court of competent jurisdiction as other fines and penalties are collected in the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT—REPEAL.

SEC. 24. That Congress reserves the right to amend or repeal this act.

The substitute was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BABCOCK, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. BABCOCK. The Committee on the District of Columbia have nothing further to offer.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 2956) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 68) granting to the State of Kansas the abandoned Fort Hays Military Reservation in said State, for the purpose of establishing

Western branches of the Kansas Agricultural College and of the Kansas State Normal School thereon and for a public park.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6827) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHoup, Mr. QUARLES, and Mr. TALIAFERRO as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9080) appropriating for the benefit and government of Puerto Rico revenues collected on importations therefrom since its evacuation by Spain, and revenues hereafter collected on such importations under existing law, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ALLISON, Mr. HALE, and Mr. COCKRELL as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

- S. 427. An act for the relief of A. F. Fleet, superintendent of the Missouri Military Academy, Mexico, Mo.; and
- §. 197. An act for the relief of Hattie A. Phillips.

R. L. PRITCHARD ET AL.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, House Document No. 514, a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of R. L. Pritchard et al. vs. The United States, will have its reference changed from the Committee on War Claims to the Committee on Claims.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CRUMPACKER, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. CARMACK, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. GAINES, indefinitely, on account of illness.

And then, on motion of Mr. BABCOCK (at 5 o'clock p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the collector of customs at Plattsburg, N. Y., relating to a refund of certain moneys to John W. Bero—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a detailed statement of refund of customs duties—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Schooner *St. Patrick*, Lemuel Bourne, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of the Schooner *Sophia*, Francis O'Meara, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9388) to provide better facilities for the safe-keeping and disbursement of public moneys in the Philippine Islands and in the islands of Cuba and Puerto Rico, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 712); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4520) granting an increase of pension to George H. French, Company A, Forty-eighth Wisconsin Infantry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 709); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LANDIS, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which

was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 746) to authorize C. R. Dobbins to accept a gold watch awarded to him by the government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of his humane and gallant services to the shipwrecked crew of the British schooner *Ashton*, of Weymouth, Nova Scotia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 710); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1906) granting an increase of pension to Agnes K. Capron, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 714); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOREING, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7975) for the relief of William F. Riley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 715); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5304) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Benjamin Wilks—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 8476) for the relief of Christopher Costello—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALDRICH: A bill (H. R. 9704) to erect a monument at or near Talladega, Ala., to commemorate the battle of Talladega, fought by Tennessee volunteers under command of Gen. Andrew Jackson, November 9, 1813, and to appropriate \$10,000 for the erection thereof—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 9705) for the reorganization of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 9706) to compel attendance of witnesses at courts-martial—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 9707) making appropriation to aid in the erection of a monument on the site of Fort Hamilton, Butler County, Ohio—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 9708) to amend an act to prohibit the passage of special or local laws in the Territories, to limit the Territorial indebtedness, and so forth—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MERCER: A bill (H. R. 9709) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the erection thereon of a municipal building in the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9710) to provide for the equitable distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande River between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, and for the purpose of building an international dam and reservoir on said river at El Paso, Tex.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEMENWAY, from the Committee on Appropriations: A bill (H. R. 9711) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 9712) to purchase a painting of the frigate *Constitution*, known as "Old Ironsides," and entitled "Old Ironsides"—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 9713) permitting the building of a dam between Coon Rapids and the north limits of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., across the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 207) to establish and fix the rank of the Commanding General and of the Adjutant-General of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LORIMER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) to provide for survey of the Illinois River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 31) authorizing the printing of an extra edition of Report No. 64, Department of Agriculture, entitled "Field Operations of Division of Soils in 1899"—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 32) authorizing the printing of an extra edition of a report entitled "Work and Expenditures of the Agricultural Experiment Stations"—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 33) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Third Report on the Investigation of the Agricultural Capabilities of Alaska—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 9714) granting an increase of pension to Alexander N. Shipley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BREAZEALE: A bill (H. R. 9715) for the relief of the estate of John M. Tessier, deceased, late of Natchitoches Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9716) for the relief of the estate of George E. Gillespie, deceased, late of Natchitoches Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9717) for the relief of the estate of Theodule Lattier, deceased, late of Natchitoches Parish, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9718) granting a pension to Mrs. Clara E. Colbath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9719) granting a pension to Amos W. Felker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 9720) for the relief of the city of Philadelphia—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9721) for the relief of Wesley Stillwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9722) to increase the pension of Mary J. D. McGlensey, widow of John F. McGlensey, late a captain in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 9723) for the relief of Amanda Harner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9724) for the relief of Margaret E. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 9725) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Dennis Lyons, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Iowa Cavalry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9726) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of E. W. Mills, late of Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Troop M, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9727) for the relief of St. John's Hospital, of Springfield, Ill.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 9728) to increase the pension of James D. Elderkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 9729) granting an increase of pension to Robert Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 9730) granting a pension to Margaret Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9731) granting a pension to Amanda F. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9732) granting a pension to Allen Place—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9733) granting a pension to Washington T. Filson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 9734) granting an increase of pension to John Weatherford, of Aurora, Ind.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9735) granting a pension to Charles H. Brisbin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 9736) granting a pension to James L. Swan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 9737) for the relief of the estate of Henry M. Baker, deceased, late of Frederick County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9738) for the relief of Thomas L. Rosses, jr.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON: A bill (H. R. 9739) granting an increase of pension to William P. Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9740) granting a pension to Sophia A. Lane—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 9741) granting an honorable discharge to James Eagan, of Blanchard, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9742) granting an honorable discharge to Abram T. Bloom, of Curwensville, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9743) granting an honorable discharge to Samuel Bailey, of Morrisdale Mines, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9744) granting a pension to Daniel Robb, of Blanchard, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9745) granting a pension to Susan Sidenbender, of Medix Run, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9746) granting a pension to Eliza White, of Hublersburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9747) granting an increase of pension to J. H. English, of Penfield, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9748) for the relief of Simon M. Preston—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS: A bill (H. R. 9749) granting a pension to Melissa A. Trulock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9750) granting a pension to Laura A. Van Nye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9751) granting a pension to David H. Drake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9752) granting a pension to Margaret Thornberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LORIMER: A bill (H. R. 9753) granting an increase of pension to Jerome P. Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 9754) granting an increase of pension to Harry C. Thorne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 9755) for the relief of S. N. Caughey, of Chicot County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 9756) for the relief of Maria McMurdie—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 9757) to correct the military record of David Campbell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 9758) granting an increase of pension to Washington Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 9759) for the relief of Lester E. Clark, alias Ephraim Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 9760) for the relief of John Zimmerman, of Madison County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9761) for the relief of Peyton Atkins, McNairy County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 9762) directing the issue of a duplicate of a lost check drawn by E. B. Atwood, lieutenant-colonel and deputy quartermaster-general, United States Army, in favor of Alfred C. Cass—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9763) for the relief of the heirs of John Baxter—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 9764) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia C. Waring—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9765) granting a pension to Harrod Newland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9766) granting an increase of pension to Myron L. Spear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9767) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles R. Stevens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9768) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John F. Neill, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9769) to authorize the payment of moneys due John J. Gosper—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 9770) granting a pension to David G. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9771) to remove the charge of desertion against James H. Streeter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFECKER: A bill (H. R. 9772) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John R. Scaggs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9773) for the relief of the Shiloh Methodist Church, of Fredericksburg, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9774) granting an increase of pension to William J. Whealton, Chincoteague, Va.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 9775) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hempstead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of S. H. Christopher, of Buena Vista, Ga., against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: Petition of Dr. F. Brandon and others, of Lafayette, Ky., against the passage of the Loud bill,

relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Grand Army of the Republic post at Owensboro, Ky., indorsing the bill to establish a Branch Home for Disabled Soldiers at or near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petition of citizens of Livingston, Mifflin, Baraboo, Freedom, Gays Mills, and Bell Center, Wis., in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BARNEY: Petition of A. Hartwig and others, of Ozaukee, and A. F. Reese and others, of Saukville, Wis., in favor of the bill to tax oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELL: Petition of Cigar Makers' Local Union No. 129, of Denver, Colo., and citizens of Routt County, Colo., and Egeria Park Protective Association, against public-land grants to any but actual settlers—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of W. A. Davis, of Colorado Springs, Colo., in favor of House bill No. 7936, making an increase in the appropriation for arming and equipping the militia of the States and Territories—to the Committee on the Militia.

Also, petitions of the North Side Baptist Church, of Denver, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Silver Plume, Colo., urging a clause in the Hawaiian constitution forbidding the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors and a prohibition of gambling and the opium trade—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petitions of citizens of the counties of Pueblo and Eagle, Colo., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of John S. Sanford, of Aroya, and O. F. Boyle and others, of Durango, Colo., favoring Government distribution of vaccine, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petitions of S. W. McKay and others, of Calais, Me., and C. F. Marsan, of North Lyndon, Me., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of R. J. McDuff and others, of La Grange, and F. J. Smith, of Portland, Me., against the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Post No. 15, Department of Maine, Grand Army of the Republic, urging the passage of Senate bill No. 1716 and House bill No. 4742, to amend section 1225 of the Revised Statutes, to provide for the detail of active and retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military instruction in public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Armory Company L and Armory Company G, Second Regiment National Guard of the State of Maine, urging the passage of House bill No. 7936, increasing the appropriation for the State militia—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of C. G. Comstock, of Albany, Mo., asking that the Government continue the manufacture and distribution of blackleg vaccine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Grand Army of the Republic posts of Kansas City, Wellsville, Argentine, Hillsdale, and Ottawa, Kans., favoring the passage of a bill to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home in or near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Johnson County, Kans., against the passage of the Loud bill relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BRENNER: Petition of F. C. Lambert and others, of Hamilton, Ohio, against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of O. E. Mitzel and others, favoring the Grout bill relating to oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petition of the retail druggists of Hamilton County, Ohio, for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumery, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of William H. Lytle Post, No. 47, Grand Army of the Republic, of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the passage of a bill to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home in or near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: Petition of the heirs of Daniel B. Bowman, of Washington County, Tenn., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURLESON: Petition of the Burleson Guards, Company K, Texas Infantry, Caldwell, Tex., in favor of House bill No. 7936, making an increase in the appropriation for arming and equipping the militia of the States and Territories—to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of Phil H. Sheridan Post, No. 25, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home for disabled soldiers at or near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petitions of J. N. Baird, of Morrison,

Ill.; H. G. Kinnard, of Brooklyn, N. Y.; Louis Goodex, of Philadelphia, Pa.; T. S. Bailey, of Traer, Iowa, and W. H. Stephens, of Altoona, Pa., favoring House bill No. 4478, to adjust the pension of soldiers who have lost limbs or who are totally disabled—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Williams Meyer, George P. Gerlinger, Louis Sievert, and others, of Maryville, Kans., and G. L. Harvie, of Brookville, Kans., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHANLER: Petitions of Street and Smith, F. M. Lupton, John W. Robe, Edward Lyman Bell, Pearson Publishing Company, of New York; R. W. Massey, Columbus, Ga.; Houghton, Mifflin & Co., publishers, Boston, Mass.; Albany News Company, M. P. Richardson, and others, of New York City, against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of L. B. Miller & Son, New York, and Union Dairy Company, Cleveland, Ohio, in favor of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Protest of the California Club, against the contemplated sale of the Calaveras Grove of Sequoias—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Petition of Warren M. Davis and others, of Marlow, N. H., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of John G. Foster Post and Anthony Colby Post, No. 85, Grand Army of the Republic, New Hampshire, in favor of House bill No. 7094—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, protest of Mrs. E. A. Keyser, George E. Tibbetts, and others, of the State of New Hampshire, against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the New Hampshire Board of Trade, of Manchester, N. H., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, in the interest of manufacturing and commercial industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the New Hampshire Board of Trade, of Manchester, N. H., in favor of the passage of the so-called Cullom bill, to make certain changes in the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COX: Petition of citizens of Hohenwald, Tenn., against the passage of the Loud bill relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Columbia, Tenn., asking for a public building in said town—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURTIS: Petition of C. J. Durst, Gracie M. Elliott, and others, of Kansas, against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Arthur Broom and others, of Topeka, Kans., favoring the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUSACK: Petition of Henry G. Dressel and other druggists, Chicago, Ill., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of the Retail Merchants' Association of Illinois, Commercial Club, Kansas City, Mo., and Mercantile Club, of Kansas City, Kans., against any legislation increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. H. Rippey Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Pittsburg, Pa., in favor of the establishment of Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Woman's Club and others, of Wilkesburg, Pa., favoring a new code of laws for Hawaii, against the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, and prohibiting the importation and sale of opium, etc.—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Petitions of A. M. Willey and other citizens, of Algona; D. L. Driver and others, of Burt; J. W. Finnell and others, of Mallard; Enos Albertson and others, of Moorland; F. L. Tribon and others, of Algona; Bert Anderson and others, of Pioneer; A. Gilmour and others, of Hobart, Iowa, favoring the passage of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. S. Forrester & Co., druggists, of Jolley, Iowa; R. W. Peet and others, of Swea City, Iowa, for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumery, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON: Protest of Warren P. Oldruff and others, of Port Henry, N. Y., against the passage of House bill No. 6071—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of J. E. Cance, E. F. Anderson, and others, of the State of Wisconsin, urging the passage of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of A. H. Kelley and citizens of Eau Claire, Tomah, Kirby, Northfield, and Northbranch, Wis., against the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to House bill No. 7097, providing for a reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the executive council of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, of Boston, Mass., in favor of the appointment of a commission to study the industrial and commercial conditions of the Chinese Empire—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, remonstrance of the Chamber of Commerce of Quincy, Ill., against a parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of William Corrie and 15 others, of Volga, Ind., against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GROUT: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to James L. Swan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions adopted by fourth-class postmasters of Washington County, Vt., praying for the passage of the Cummings bill, increasing the compensation of postmasters of the fourth-class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: Petition of G. W. Dannettelle, of Evansville, Ind., against the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Peter Roasner and other citizens of Indiana, praying for a recognition at the hands of the Government of the prisoners of war of the late rebellion—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of King David Post, No. 556, and Archer Post, No. 28, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, indorsing the bill to establish a Branch Home for Disabled Soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of James A. Garfield Post, No. 34, State of California, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JETT: Petition of L. M. Hartsock and 53 citizens of Nokomis, Ill., in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petitions of Rufus R. Wood, of Davenport, Wash., and M. M. Banister, of Centralia, Wash., in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Petition of citizens of Kingston and Ulster County, N. Y., in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LANE: Resolutions of Grand Army of the Republic Post No. 250, of Milton, Iowa, and Post No. 73, Grand Army of the Republic, of Maquoketa, Iowa, in favor of House bill No. 7094—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Harry C. Thorne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of G. F. Beakley and other citizens of Gloversville, N. Y., against the passage of the Loud bill relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LORIMER: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Jerome P. Bates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petition of 600 citizens of Licking County, Ohio, in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McPHERSON: Petition of R. Lawrence and 16 others, of Atlantic; M. N. Eslerch and 24 others, of Audubon; J. J. Hipsley and 40 others, of Avoca; Nische Christensen and 43 others, of Brayton, Iowa, in favor of the bill to tax oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of W. H. Branthoffer and others, of Juniata County, Pa., to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Merchants' Club of Chicago, Ill., in relation to the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, protests of the Retail Merchants' Association of Illinois, the Commercial Club of Kansas City, Kans., and Mercantile Club of Kansas City, Mo., against the passage of the Grout, Tawney, or any other bills increasing the tax on butterine, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSH: Resolution of a mass meeting of citizens of Quincy, Ill., and the board of supervisors of Adams County, Ill.,

expressing sympathy with the republics of South Africa—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKISON: Petition of B. J. Thompson and others, of Edgerton, Ohio, in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Van Wert Post, No. 627, and Grand Army of the Republic post of Ottawa, Ohio, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of S. J. Gustin and others, of De Soto, Nebr., favoring House bill No. 3717, to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the publisher of Journal of the Switchmen's Union of North America, Omaha, Nebr., in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Grand Army of the Republic post of Westpoint, Nebr., indorsing House bill No. 7094, for the location of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolutions of the city council of Boston, Mass., for the construction of gunboats and cruisers in the Charlestown Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, for the appointment of a board to consider commercial interests of Japan and China—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Petition of W. F. Cody Post, No. 253, of Wallace, Nebr., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the location of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting of citizens of Hooker County, Nebr., against the alienation of public lands by the United States to any but actual settlers—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NORTON of South Carolina: Resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Club of Columbia, S. C., favoring the passage of Senate bill No. 1439, to amend the act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'GRADY: Petition of J. H. Daily, W. R. Budlong, and others, of Hilton and Riga, N. Y., against the passage of House bill No. 6071, known as the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolution of the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce, Milwaukee, Wis., relative to House bill No. 7097, providing for a reorganization of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petition of Indianapolis Light Infantry, Indianapolis, Ind., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 7936, increasing the appropriation for the State militia—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. PEREA: Petition of Woman Suffrage Association of New Mexico, asking for the passage of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of New Mexico, urging that Congress do not insert the word "male" in the suffrage clause in whatever form of government is enacted for Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, or any other newly acquired possessions—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petitions of Robert Barr, jr., and others, of Kendallville, and W. D. Rhenbottom, of La Grange, Ind., against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Resolutions of Company F, First Regiment Nebraska National Guard, Madison, Nebr., favoring the passage of House bill No. 7936, increasing the appropriations for arming and equipping the military of the States and Territories—to the Committee on Militia.

By Mr. RIDGELY: Petition of P. A. Bird & Son, of Parsons, publisher of the Williston Journal, and W. P. Hazen, of Chitopa, Kans., in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of J. F. Trumbull Post, No. 82, of Stonington, Conn.; A. G. Warner Post, No. 54, Putnam, Conn., and Post at Chaplin, Conn., Grand Army of the Republic, in support of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN (by request): Petition of citizens of Plummer, Highmarket, Richland, Maxon, Martinsburg, and Mannsville, N. Y., for a law subjecting food and dairy products to the

laws of the State or Territory into which they are imported—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petitions of Alice Millar and citizens of Theresa, Harrisville, and Sterlingbush, N. Y., against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petitions of Jerry Rusk Post, No. 42; W. A. Selby Post, No. 39, of Reynolds, N. Dak., Grand Army of the Republic, Department of North Dakota, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at or near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Retail Grocers and General Merchants' Association of North Dakota, urging the passage of the pure-food and dairy bill, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Post No. 24, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of North Dakota, in support of the House bill No. 4742, to provide for the detail of active and retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military education in public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: Petition of the Equal Suffrage Association of Kokomo, Ind.; also petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of the State of Indiana, praying for woman suffrage in the newly acquired possessions—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Petition of sundry churches and societies of Passaic, N. J., urging a clause in the Hawaiian constitution forbidding the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors and a prohibition of gambling and the opium trade—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. STOKES: Papers to accompany House bill No. 6445, relating to butterine and food products and their transportation—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Protest of Corinne Hayward and 9 others, of Hayward, N. H.; Effie O. Weeks and 11 others, and Annie E. Quimby and 14 others, of Manchester, N. H., against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of S. Z. Weeks and 9 others, of Gilmanton, N. H., in favor of the bill to tax oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of S. E. Adams and others, of Johnsons Mills, N. C., against the passage of the Loud bill, No. 6071, relating to second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WACHTER: Petition of Goldsborough Post, No. 36, and Custer Post, No. 6, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Maryland, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petition of J. G. Foster Post, No. 163, of South Framingham, Mass., Grand Army of the Republic, praying for the passage of House bill No. 7094—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of George Ridlen Post, No. 275, of Scottsburg, Ind., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home for disabled soldiers at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, March 20, 1900.

Prayer by Rev. HUGH JOHNSTON, D. D., of Baltimore, Md.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. DAVIS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

AGES OF EMPLOYEES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, stating, in response to a resolution of the 16th instant calling for information as to the ages of employees of the Treasury Department and the number permanently incapacitated, etc., that the information called for would be furnished at the earliest practicable date; which was ordered to lie on the table.

BRUNSWICK (GA.) HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, stating, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant calling for the report made by H. L. Marindin, the officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey detailed by the Secretary of War to make survey of the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga., that the Auditor for the War Department reports that the papers called for are of a technical nature, and that it is deemed inexpedient to copy them, and that the original papers are transmitted herewith; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT NORFOLK, VA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Supervising Architect relating to the necessity for an additional appropriation of \$7,500 for the court-house and post-office building, Norfolk, Va.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL WATCHMEN IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an additional estimate of appropriation for salaries, Office of the Secretary of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1901, for 6 additional watchmen and 1 elevator conductor for service in the old General Post-Office building, now occupied by offices of the Interior Department; in all, \$5,040; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented memorials of the Herald, of Hammondsport, N. Y., and a memorial of the Wayne County Alliance, of Sodus, N. Y., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 338, Patrons of Husbandry, of Williamsport, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to curtail the unreasonable powers of great monopolies and trusts, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 66, Printing Pressmen's Union, of Syracuse, N. Y., and a petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York, praying that the Government Printer be authorized to print the label of the Allied Printing Trades on all publications of the Government; which were referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. TURNER presented a petition of Washington Grange, No. 82, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, and a petition of Washougal Grange, No. 192, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of adulterated food products; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented a petition of Washougal Grange, No. 192, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, and a petition of Enterprise Grange, No. 85, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, praying for the extension of free rural mail delivery; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Washougal Grange, No. 192, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, and a petition of Lyon Grange, No. 1343, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, praying for the election of Senators by a popular vote of the people; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of Enterprise Grange, No. 85, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, and a petition of Washougal Grange, No. 192, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, praying for the establishment of postal savings banks; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Enterprise Grange, No. 85, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, and a petition of Washougal Grange, No. 192, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Washington Grange, No. 82, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, and a petition of Washougal Grange, No. 192, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure adequate anti-trust laws; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Enterprise Grange, No. 85, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, and a petition of Washougal Grange, No. 192, Patrons of Husbandry, of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of shoddy in manufactured goods; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented memorials of Washougal Grange, No. 192, Patrons of Husbandry, and Enterprise Grange, No. 85, Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the construction of reservoirs or irrigating canals for the irrigation of arid lands; which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. COCKRELL presented memorials of the Democrat, of Hickory County; the Hamilton Index-Gazette, and the German Methodist Preachers' Association, all in the State of Missouri, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial of the Ledger, of Union, Nebr., and a memorial of the Nebraska Teacher, of Lincoln, Nebr.,